THE CHURCH AND EDUCATION

HENRY H. SWEETS

LC427
.S97

LIBRARY OF PRINCETON
THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY
4.29.40
LC427
.S97

APR 29 1940
THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY

The CHURCH AND EDUCATION

by

HENRY H. SWEETS

Secretary of Christian Education of the Presbyterian Church in the United States

Author of "Planning the Good Life"

PRESBYTERIAN COMMITTEE OF PUBLICATION

RICHMOND · VIRGINIA

Copyright 1939, Presbyterian Committee of Publication, Richmond, Va.

4551—(1)—10817

CONTENTS

PAGE

The Church and Education 5

Statement of the Committee

Foreword 7

CHAPTER I

The Rise of Education—The Church 15

CHAPTER II

The State Enters Education 36

CHAPTER III

The Emphasis of the Church 52

CHAPTER IV

The Point of View of the State 80

CHAPTER V

The Present Opportunity of the Church 104

THE CHURCH AND EDUCATION

Statement of the Committee

THIS book was prepared in response to a request of the College Group of the Presbyterian Educational Association of the South for study by the various groups of men, women, and youth.

Dr. Henry H. Sweets at the request of the Committee of the Association wrote the book. In it he has put the rich experience of thirty-five years in the field of education. It is hoped that it will be used as a source book for study during the next year or two. It will be followed by studies in other fields of Church education.

Democracy must have a religious basis if it is to survive. The hope of its survival lies in our Christian institutions—the home, the church, and the school. There is nothing more vital to the welfare of our Republic than is Christian Education.

It is earnestly hoped that this study book, THE CHURCH AND EDUCATION, will be carefully studied by our ministers and used as the basis of discussions and prayer-meeting talks and of participating in the discussion groups in the community.

It is expected that the book will be used by ministers, by the Woman's Auxiliaries and Circles, by groups of Men and Young People, and in the adult education groups.

The plan is to keep the book before our people for a year or two, until they become conscious of the vast importance of what is now taking place in our Republic.

The new proposals for public education will be carefully discussed at public forums, service clubs, Parent-Teacher Associations, women's clubs, and similar organizations. Presbyterians should know what all of this discussion is about. The Presbyterian Church ought once more to be brought into the place of leadership in education which it so clearly and definitely held years ago.

CHAS. E. DIEHL
J. R. MCCAIN
F. H. CALDWELL
WILLIAM C. PRESSLY
Committee

FOREWORD

CAN Democracy save the social order? Can organized Education save civilization? Can the Church save society? These questions, in varied forms, are being anxiously asked from millions of hearts.

There is only one answer that can truthfully be given: No, they cannot. Something far deeper and higher and broader is needed. Back of all these organizations and agencies, with their varied purposes and plans and methods, are primary, fundamental, spiritual facts and forces which must be recognized and utilized.

These three great agencies and organizations—democracy, education, and the Church—working together, can bring individuals and the social groups under the influence of the facts, the light, and the Power which alone can do this big thing. It is apparent to thoughtful people that something must be done. Politicians, statesmen, scientists, teachers, church officers, and members agree that all is not well with the world. Events have shaken the habits of thinking and aroused thoughtful men and women everywhere. Scientists and educators are urging larger and more intelligent use of the social sciences. A prominent public educator is quoted as saying: "After all our years of prating about training citizens, we've got to begin doing it—and in a hurry too."

The problems before the world are intricate and complex. The causes and suggested cures of these situations are numerous and varied. Many people are baffled and in an age of confusion are actively seeking to recapture the abiding values of life.

There has arisen a feeling of defeat on the part of many. Instincts have failed, hopes have been blasted, plans have come to naught. The anxieties caused by economic instability have made deep inroads on the mind and hearts of

men of wealth. The losses from unemployment and the consequent inability to fulfill the desire for a larger life and for the culture and nurture of the family have brought a crushing load on the hearts of noble laboring men. All have been too prone to complain, to give over to gloomy despair and unreasoning fear. Some have tired of life and have surrendered.

Some of those who with sincerity and zeal are seeking a remedy for the situation are ignorant of history, or have overlooked some of the fundamental causes of man's distress. Some are selfish and their thought is colored by self-interest. Some church people take a narrow, restricted view of God and His purpose for the world, becoming separatists like those so severely condemned by Jesus two thousand years ago. Some educators whose mental life has been developed through early, intense, and narrow specialization, have been rendered blind to facts and forces in fields other than their own. Their unhappy limitations lead them to propose remedies that have oft been tried and failed and cause them to become critical and intolerant and censorious. Their excuse that they are intolerant of intolerance does not remedy the mistakes they make or the disunion they cause. It would be well to recall the words of Nicholas Murray Butler, who wrote of the broadly educated scholar: "Only the scholar can realize how little that is being said and thought in the modern world is in any sense new. It was the colossal triumph of the Greeks and Romans and of the great thinkers of the Middle Ages to sound the depths of almost every problem which human nature has to offer, and to interpret human thought and human aspiration with astounding profundity and insight. Unhappily, these deep-lying facts which should be controlling in the life of a civilized people with a historical background, are known only to a few, while the many grasp, now at an ancient and well-demonstrated falsehood and now at an old and well-proved truth, as if each had all the attractions of novelty."

There is a tendency today to center the thought on the symptoms and to neglect the disease; to survey, discuss, compare, classify, and catalogue the outward conduct of the human race and to fail to comprehend the constitution and the laws that govern the inner man. Symptoms must be studied, conduct must be carefully examined, but remedies must be sought beneath the surface facts.

Both religion and education have to do primarily with the soul of man. As a man "thinketh within himself, so is he." His material welfare and environment are of great importance, but they are of secondary consideration. To transform the world around him the thought of man must be awakened, the desire created, and the purpose and will aroused to action. Religion and education seek to create a new social order by creating a new soul within; both seek to educate, that is to draw out in harmonious accord all man's powers. In religion this is called edification, a building-up; in education it is often referred to as culture, training.

It is a matter of supreme importance that individuals, homes, Church, school and all the members of the democracy seek to know the causes of our failures and to discover and use the remedies. Down deep in the human heart is the consciousness of failure, of sin. "Sin" means "to miss the mark," to fail in fulfilling the plan of God for one's life. These things are not concealed. This message came to Israel: "For this commandment which I command thee this day, it is not hidden from thee, neither is it far off. It is not in heaven, that thou shouldest say, Who shall go up for us to heaven, and bring it unto us, that we may hear it, and do it? Neither is it beyond the sea, that thou shouldest say, Who shall go over the sea for us, and bring it unto us, that we may hear it, and do it? But the word is very nigh unto thee, in thy mouth, and in thy heart, that thou mayest do it."[1]

This Voice of God in the human soul too often has been stifled. Possibly we have emphasized too exclusively love and

[1]Deuteronomy 30:11-14.

peace and humanity, and have forgotten the high moralities of truth, of purity, of righteousness and of justice, all of which have their rise in the filial, reverent fear and love of God. It is well to heed the second great commandment, "Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself," but this will not be done until we know the spirit and purpose and come to obey the first great commandment. George Adam Smith declares that the fall of man has resulted from "the increase of knowledge and of power unaccompanied by reverence." God cannot be pushed out of life. An illuminating record is found in II Chronicles 26:15 and 16. The inventive genius and power of organization of King Uzziah are recorded with this revealing note added: "And his name spread far abroad; for he was marvelously helped, till he was strong. But when he was strong, his heart was lifted up, so that he did corruptly, and he trespassed against the Lord his God."

American education is conditioned by our form of government which in many ways intensifies the problems.

Democracy is a great ideal. It includes all the people, and the home, the school, and the Church. Rightly constituted and guided and controlled it provides the finest type of government yet conceived by the mind of man. American democracy, in which government is exercised through elected representatives, was described by Abraham Lincoln as "the government of the people, by the people, for the people." Sir William Blackstone (1723-1780), the great English jurist and authority on law, wrote: "In a democracy, where the right of making laws resides in the people at large, public virtue, or goodness of intention, is more likely to be found, than either of the other qualities of government."[2] But history, since the days of Blackstone, reveals a sad lack of "public virtue" and "goodness of intention" of many of those who have been called by the people to bear rule in the democracies of the world. There is no way in which an

---

[2]Sir William Blackstone, *Commentaries on the Laws of England*, Introduction 2, p. 49.

ideal social order may be established and maintained except by dependable men and women. The world looks back with deep interest at the thoroughly planned "Republic" of Plato; Thomas More's unique dream of "Utopia" (printed in 1516); the "New Atlantis" of Francis Bacon (printed after his death in 1629); Thomas Campanella's (1568-1637) "City of the Sun"; and the elaborate outline of James Harrington's "Oceana" (1656). But each of these ideal commonwealths reveals one fatal lack—it did not provide ideal men and women for citizenship. A utopian plan demands a utopian man.

A little while before his death in 1938, Canon Burnett Streeter, Provost of Queens College, Oxford, and the author of *Reality,* wrote: "I was one of those who expected much from the League of Nations and from the various projects started since the war for dealing with economic conflict and social reform. These things are failing humanity, not from any imperfection in the machinery, but from the lack of sufficient goodwill in the mass of mankind and in their leaders, to make such machinery work. I saw how largely the moral energies of Christianity were demoralized, partly through difference of opinion on points of doctrine or Church organization, but still more by failure to realize in actual life the religious and moral ideals which Christians are unanimous in professing."[3]

We cannot all think alike; the human mind has not been completely standardized. We may well rejoice in this, for otherwise the whole world might be crushed by dictators and real, spiritual progress might be stopped. In forming a democracy and a Church some place must be left for individual thought and for free expression. One day just preceding the presidential election in 1924, the daily papers of New York City gave the views of distinguished citizens of scientific spirit and attitude and method as to the importance and outcome of the election. Charles W. Eliot, President

[3]Pamphlet, *In Memoriam.*

Emeritus of Harvard University, intimated that only by the election of John W. Davis could America save its soul and minister to the deeper needs of the world. Nicholas Murray Butler, President of Columbia University, said that the election of Calvin Coolidge was of utmost importance to the security of the nation. John Dewey, head of the department of philosophy of Columbia University, declared that both of the old parties were talking "bunk," and that Robert M. LaFollette offered the only program that could appeal to thoughtful men. Fully recognizing the diversity of thought in the citizens of our democracy a supreme effort should be made to understand each other and to find real bases of agreement on which the nation can build. While we cannot all think alike, yet as one reads the articles and books of educators he must be struck by the unanimity of the desire to make education do bigger and better things for man and society. Their methods of approach vary, their ideals are dissimilar, their plans are far apart, their methods are varied, but in all the maze of their ideas one is rejoiced to behold a striving after high ideals.

Under any conditions in a democracy it is necessary that some sort of mutual understanding be reached before progress can be made. This is particularly urgent today when democracy faces its present difficulties. Democracy has been on trial ever since it was first tried, but it is possibly now under heavier strain than ever before. Whenever the problems of State touch religion the Church is deeply concerned. The Church has never been perfect but today it faces responsibilities so complex and urgent that they are almost baffling. President Eliot, after having served for a quarter of a century as president of Harvard University, was asked what had been his leading purpose. He replied, "To secure co-operation." The immediate call today to Church and to school is to think, to discuss, to act, and to co-operate.

In the past the Church has shown a co-operative spirit. Believing in the separation of Church and State, appreciat-

ing the fact that a democracy for its safety and perpetuity must provide educated, sovereign citizens, the leaders in the churches in America were willing that many of their educational institutions, born in poverty, nourished in self-denial, rendered great because of the great men who molded the lives of the students, should die that public education might be provided. Some day a thrilling chapter of history will be written revealing the forward-looking thought and patriotic action of these men.

The Church wisely determined to continue some of its schools and colleges to assist in the great task of training an intelligent citizenship, and to emphasize the Christian element in education and to train its own leadership. From the Church institutions came the able men who planned our wise and effective state systems of education and guided our state universities and agricultural and mechanical colleges. From its colleges such men and women continue to come.

Fortunately, many leaders of both Church and State in the early days saw there need be no conflict between the work of these two bodies—that in reality both were needed—complementing each other. Every true American must regret that confusion came into the minds of many, both in religious bodies and in the commonwealths. Long years of discussion about "godless universities" and about the "unwarranted intrusion of sectarian organizations" in the field of education should have been given over to careful, constructive, co-operative statesmanship in this fundamental task.

Co-operation to be effective calls for understanding and adjustment between all individuals and groups in the democracy. The home, the Church, and the school have not fully met their individual or their joint responsibility to this generation in the sphere of education. There is a growing need and demand that separately and together they discharge their entire obligation. This calls for sympathetic understanding, careful co-operation, and prompt and intelligent

action. Continued discussion alone is not enough. The problems are neither theoretical nor remote. A hundred years ago Thomas Carlyle said: "Man's grand business is not to see what lies dimly in the distance, but to do what lies clearly at hand." Only thus can the desired end be reached.

To avoid hopelessness and despair it must be borne in mind that the progress of truth and righteousness and justice and peace in the world is slow. Man's memory is brief, his vision is short, his powers of comprehension are limited. He is prone to become disillusioned, discouraged, cynical, and hopeless. He forgets that "the Kingdom of God cometh not with observation"; that progress in the things of the spirit cannot be defined by visible measurements like an earthly kingdom. Its growth in the world is a process of pervasion like the working of leaven through the lump. But this should not lull him to sleep.

The facts recorded in the following chapters are not remote from our experience. They are vitally relevant to our lives, our homes, our Church, and our Nation. They ought to be carefully studied; they should excite and hold our attention; they may change some of our previous notions and outlooks. They should awake all to co-operative action. If this study is used in a small way to help solve some of the intricate problems faced by our democracy, the writer will be abundantly repaid for his labor.

HENRY H. SWEETS

410 Urban Building.
Louisville, Ky.

CHAPTER I

THE RISE OF EDUCATION—THE CHURCH

THE religious impulse has been evident at all times in the field of education. It has provided the incentive, the support, and the development of education from the dawn of history.

"Education in its simplest form is found among the primitive societies of savage and barbarian peoples. Here one finds no school, no method of education consciously recognized as such, and only the slightest differentiation of a teaching class. And yet there is evident the essential characteristic of the educational process—the fitting of the child to his physical and social environment through the appropriating of the experience of previous generations."[1]

Primitive man was occupied in the securing of food, clothing, shelter, and safety and had little consciousness of individual rights and obligations—he was largely submerged in the clan or the tribe. His education was somewhat similar to the training of the animal today. His emotions, largely of hatred and fear, found little basis in the intelligence. His quest for protection and power was through cults and rituals and the influence of the priest. His desire was to come into the right relation to the powers manifesting themselves in the world about him. To do this he devoted himself to propitiatory rites. The mythologies of ancient peoples are both interesting and instructive. As the people together faced the great mysteries of nature and of human life a body of myths and legends grew up and was transmitted to succeeding generations. And thus simple religious organizations were developed.

[1]Paul Monroe, *A Brief Course in the History of Education* (The Macmillan Co., 1911), p. 1. Used by permission.

The religious instinct in man is universal and ineradicable. As man advances to higher states of civilization he recognizes the force and directing power of religion on his intelligence. His reason is brought into the eternal and universal quest. Athens, filled with altars, had one shrine with the inscription, TO THE UNKNOWN GOD.[2]

In reviewing the early efforts in education at all times and in all lands one is struck with the fact that the religious motive and influence are everywhere present. Whether conducted by the tribe or state or nation or by some cult or church, reference was had to some form of deity and some religious sanctions were evident.

Daniel Webster was correct when, in an impassioned speech, he exclaimed: "In what age, by what sect, where, when, by whom has religious education been excluded from the education of the youth? Nowhere! Never! Everywhere and at all times it has been regarded as essential."

Greek Education

The Greeks in their plan of education did not use the religious element so fully as many other peoples. Much of the training of the children was public and they were restrained and directed by public opinion. Frequent conversations were provided, supervised by adults, concerned with moral and social problems. The child was committed to *the pedagogue* and the youth to *the inspirer*. They laid great emphasis on the full development of the individual. Socrates urged the duty "Know thyself." Ancient Greece rose high in the scale of such moral training. H. T. Freeman declared:

"The training of character was before all things the object of Hellenic education; it was this which the Hellenic parents particularly demanded of the schoolmaster. So strongly did they believe that virtue could be taught, that they held the

[2]Acts 17:23-31.

teacher responsible for any subsequent misbehavior of his pupils."[3]

Paul Monroe said: "The work of the Greeks was to determine the things in this life worth living for. Aristotle says that the aim of life is 'living happily and beautifully.' And the best expressions of their civilization give us this knowledge, or at least indicate to us their realization of this high ideal. Add to this the one great element since added to civilization through the Christian religion, and the ideal now formulated for our life and for our educational process is but slightly more advanced. In the list—political freedom, intellectual freedom and attainment, moral freedom and life, aesthetic appreciation, and power of accomplishment—we have made but one great change, that of substituting material achievement for the aesthetic expression of personality. This change is not an unmitigated blessing nor an unqualified advance."[4]

The Greek emphasized the individual and his moral worth, recognized the importance of the education of the body as well as the mind, urged understanding of self and the practice of moderation in all things. Their school system was largely taken over by the Romans and many Roman youth were educated in the Greek universities. As its legions extended the Roman Empire over the world the Greek influence was spread far and wide over Roman roads. Not able to conquer the world physically because of the individualistic tendencies the Greeks penetrated the other nations artistically and intellectually. The English jurist Sir Henry James Sumner Maine (1822-1888) declared: "Except the blind forces of Nature, nothing moves in this world which is not Greek in its origin." We may smile at some of the

---

[3]H. T. Freeman, *The Schools of Hellas* (London, 1907), p. 81.

[4]Paul Monroe, *A Brief Course in the History of Education* (The Macmillan Co., 1911), p. 29. Used by permission.

ardent Hellenists, but no student of history can fail to acknowledge with deepest interest and most sincere appreciation the marvelous contribution of these people to all succeeding generations, in their incomparable art, their inspiring literature, their helpful philosophy, and their scientific knowledge.

Hebrew Education in the Home

The contribution to education by the Hebrew nation was of supreme importance. Moses was one of the great educators of the world. He was a man of thought and action and spiritual discernment. After his education in the learning of the Egyptians, and years of study and communion with nature and with nature's God in Midian, he gave his efforts to educating Israel.

In the book of Deuteronomy we have a summing-up of the teaching of Moses. It contains a clear statement of *theology:* "Hear, O Israel: the Lord our God is one Lord."[5] No clearer statement of reality and finality had ever been given to man. The effect of this belief on the character and influence of the Hebrew race and on the world has been profound, extensive, and creative. The Mohammedans incorporated it in their creed and five times every day the muezzins, from the heights of thousands of minarets, call the faithful to prayer with the words: "There is no god but God." The same thought permeates the creed of all the Christian Church—both Catholic and Protestant.

It gives the only true basis for *religion:* "And thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thine heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy might." Jesus declared this to be the first and great commandment of the law. The Apostle Paul in the thirteenth chapter of First Corinthians clearly reveals that "love is the greatest thing in the world."

---

[5]Deuteronomy 6:4.

The passage then gives some basic principles of true *education.* "By what means," asks Dr. Walter W. Moore, "can these two indispensable things—Theology and Religion—be preserved from generation to generation? How can we secure the preservation among men of this true knowledge of God and this genuine devotion to His service?"[6] Moses answers *by education,* intimate, personal, habitual, real, urgent. Note the process outlined by Moses:

"And these words, which I command thee this day, shall be in thine heart: and thou shalt teach them diligently unto thy children, and shalt talk of them when thou sittest in thy house, and when thou walkest by the way, and when thou liest down, and when thou risest up. And thou shalt bind them for a sign upon thy hand, and they shall be for frontlets between thine eyes. And thou shalt write them upon the door-posts of thy house, and upon thy gates."

Educators have at times departed far from the educational plans of Moses, but great losses have thereby been sustained and there is sad need today for a return to some of these basic principles in elementary education.

The Contribution of Jesus

The Master Teacher of all the ages is Jesus Christ. It is no exaggeration to say that all true progress in the field of education is found to be an approximation to His purpose, spirit, and method in teaching. This thought was in the mind of T. R. Glover when he wrote of "the teacher and His disciples" in *The Jesus of History:* "I have been treating Him almost as if he were an authority on pedagogy. Fortunately He never discussed pedagogy, never used the terms I have been using. But He dealt with men, He taught and influenced them, and it is worth our study to understand

[6]Walter W. Moore, *Religion in the Home* (tract published by the Committee of Christian Education and Ministerial Relief of the Presbyterian Church, U. S., Louisville, Ky., 1909), p. 8.

how He did it—to master His methods. 'One loving spirit sets another on fire.' "[7]

"It is very wonderful to me," wrote Phillips Brooks, "to see how the disciples caught His method." In his scholarly and stimulating book, *Jesus the Master Teacher,* Herman Harrell Horne says:

"One may well wonder why it is that, though books have been written about education since the Republic of Plato and about Jesus since the Gospel of Mark, it is only the present generation that has seen books written about Jesus as an educator." And then he hints at a sad but evident fact: "Perhaps it is because those who knew about Jesus did not know about education, while those who knew about education did not know about Jesus. There may also have been the feeling that reverence for Jesus as divine was inconsistent with the study of his methods as a human teacher."[8]

"Building on the old Hebrew moral law and the importance of the personal life," writes E. P. Cubberley, "Jesus made his appeal to the individual, and sought the moral regeneration of society through the moral regeneration of individual men and women. This idea of individuality and of personal souls worth saving was a new idea in a world where the submergence of the individual in the state had everywhere up to that time been the rule. Even the Hebrews, in their great desire to perpetuate their race and faith, had suppressed and absorbed the individual in his religious state. The teachings of Jesus, on the other hand, with their emphasis on charity, sympathy, self-sacrifice, and the brotherhood of all men, tended to obliterate nationality, while the emphasis they gave to the future life, for which life here

[7]T. R. Glover, *The Jesus of History* (Association Press, 1918), p. 84.
[8]Herman Harrell Horne, *Jesus the Master Teacher* (Association Press, 1920), p. IX-X.

was but a preparation, tended to subordinate the interests of the state and withdraw the concern of men from worldly affairs. In a series of simple sermons, Jesus set forth the basis of this new faith which he, and after him his disciples, offered to the world."[9]

Wherever Christianity has gone it has awakened a new interest in education and has sought to introduce higher and nobler ends. It has reached across all barriers of race and color and nationality.

The schools connected with the Jewish synagogues, instituted for the purpose of educating the youth in the knowledge of God and of the law with its expositions and precepts, were doubtless taken as a model. Dr. Howe expresses the belief that the office of teacher in the primitive Christian church was not materially different from that of scribe, doctor, or teacher in the Jewish.

The Middle Ages

Even during the more corrupt periods of the Church attention was still given to the idea of education. The Sixth Council of the Church at Constantinople, A.D. 680, directed the presbyters to have schools in country towns and villages to which the children of the faithful should have access without any cost to the parents, unless they desired to make a charitable present, by way of a voluntary offering. Under the Emperor Charlemagne, bishops were ordered to "set up schools to teach both grammar and the knowledge of the Scriptures." A later Council made the decree: "That schools of the Holy Scriptures and human learning be erected in order that the fruits of both kinds of learning, divine and human, may increase in the Church of God."

---

[9]Ellwood P. Cubberley, *The History of Education* (Houghton Mifflin Co., 1920), p. 86.

During the long night of the Middle Ages the Church was almost wholly alone in its efforts to diffuse knowledge. Paul Monroe calls attention to the fact that: "The movement toward the secularization of the Latin schools begun in the fifteenth century, was completed by the Reformation movement in the sixteenth. This secularization related to the control of schools and not to the purpose and character of study. Even under state control the dominant motive was the religious one. The rectors of these schools, as well as many of their teachers, were Protestant leaders or ministers. The dominant influence in the boards of control and visitation was always exercised by the representative of the Church."[10]

The Reformation

With the Reformation came a new era in education. The great purpose of all the leaders was to bring the great eternal truths to bear upon the hearts and lives of the people. In almost every instance the efforts of these men were directed to the education of the people in order that they might know the will of God and understand the Bible and that teachers might be developed to expound its truths. Luther, Melanchthon, Erasmus, Calvin, Knox, and the other great men of that illustrious day laid the foundations of a public education of a religious nature.

The educational institutions were controlled by the clergy, who appointed the officers and teachers with the sanction of the council. The schools were supported by the State and instruction was open to all who would avail themselves of it. This was clearly expressed by Luther in his *Address to the Mayors and Councilmen of the German Cities:* "Were there neither soul, heaven, nor hell, it would still be necessary to have schools for the sake of affairs here

[10]Paul Monroe, *A Brief Course in the History of Education* (The Macmillan Co., 1911), p. 200. Used by permission.

below, as the history of the Greeks and Romans plainly teaches. The world has need of educated men and women, to the end that the men may govern the country properly, and that the women may properly bring up their children, care for their domestics and direct the affairs of their households."

Especially was education pre-eminent in the work of Calvin. The very year he entered the Republic of Geneva, 1536, was marked by the establishment of a school. He also set about at once to establish a large Gymnasium and an Academy. The state was poor, the public affairs greatly disturbed, but the Gymnasium (or College) was established in 1558, and the Academy (or University) in 1559.

"Calvin, Knox, and the Melvilles were not more zealous for the preaching of the Sabbath than for the teaching of the week. In Scotland, the two went forward with equal step. Wherever there was a parish-church, there was a parish-school. The same court which ordained the pastor appointed the schoolmaster. The same office-bearer who ruled the church, superintended the school. And Scotland rejoices, to this day, in a system which has made the daily lesson of every hamlet and mountain-glen the means of training up a generation armed at all points against religious error."[11]

After the long and fateful siege of Leyden in 1574, William of Orange (1533-1584) offered to reward the citizens for their gallant defense either by exempting them from taxes for a number of years or by establishing a university in their city. The followers of this great Calvinist said, "We want the university," and the University of Leyden was founded in 1575. This same spirit and ideal of education

---

[11]Jas. W. Alexander, D.D., Report on Parochial Schools, to 1846 General Assembly.

was carried into Scotland by John Knox (1505-1572) and across the Atlantic Ocean to America.

It would be interesting to trace the development of the popular educational idea through Scotland, England, Holland, France, and Germany; but we must come to the question of education in America.

In the American Colonies

The religious impulse was clearly evident in all the early education in the American Colonies. The first settlers of America were chiefly of the Protestant faith. They were driven to these shores by their high veneration for the Christian religion. Seeking religious liberty they built all their institutions upon the firm foundation of religion and education. This was true especially of the French Huguenots, who went to the coasts of the Carolinas; the Calvinistic Dutch and Walloons who settled in New Amsterdam; the Scotch and the Scotch-Irish Presbyterians who entered New Jersey and extended their habitations along the Alleghany Mountain ranges into all the southern Colonies; the English Quakers about Philadelphia; a few English Baptists and Methodists in eastern Pennsylvania; Lutherans, Moravians, Mennonites, Dunkers and the German Reformed people who settled in Pennsylvania; the Calvinist dissenters from the English National Church, known as Puritans, who settled the New England Colonies, and who gave large direction to the future development of education in America."[12]

The attitude of the Puritan colonists is revealed in the following statement printed in a pamphlet in 1643, and now carved on the granite pillar of the east gate at Harvard:

> "After God had carried us safe to New England
> And we had builded our houses

[12]Ellwood P. Cubberley, *Public Education in the United States* (Houghton Mifflin Co., 1934), pp. 13-15.

Provided necessaries for our livelihood
Reared convenient places for God's worship
And settled the Civill government
One of the next things we longed for
And looked after was to advance learning
And perpetuate it to posterity
Dreading to leave an illiterate ministry
To the Churches when our present ministers
Shall lie in the Dust."

New England in Early Days

Scarcely had the Plymouth Colony been established when its inhabitants were taxed for schools. It is claimed in Dwight's History of Connecticut that the school law passed in 1648 was "the first common school law passed in the world."

In new England all education was carried on in a deeply religious spirit. The preamble of one of the earliest statutes of Massachusetts directing that a grammar school be set up in every town having one hundred householders, is as follows: "One chief point of that old deluder, Satan, to keep men from a knowledge of the Scriptures. . ." learning was in danger of "being buried in the grave of our fathers in church and commonwealth."

In a discussion of the beginnings of education in America, Ellwood P. Cubberley says: "Schools, with us, as with the older European countries from which our early settlers came, arose as children of the church. From the instruments of religion they have been gradually changed into instruments of the state. The first schools in America were clearly the fruits of the Protestant Revolt in Europe. The reformers everywhere had insisted upon the necessity of the Gospel as a means to personal salvation. This meant, carried to its logical conclusion, that each child, girls as well as boys, should be taught to read so that they might become acquainted with the commandments of God and learn what

was demanded of them. Not being able to realize their ideals of life and worship in the old home lands, large numbers of religious congregations left Europe and came as a body to America. Here they settled in the wilderness and began life again. Among other things they brought with them their European ideas as to religion and the training of children, and hence a European background lies behind all the beginnings of American education."[13]

At first the education was carried on chiefly in the home. The power and influence of this custom cannot be overemphasized. The children were taught to read and to participate in worship both in the home and in the church. Practical and religious training was also afforded through apprenticeship where the master gave instruction in reading and religion. The religious government of the towns, which was usually in partnership with or dominated by the church, early began the establishment of Latin Schools to prepare the boys for college.

The first of these schools was established in 1636. In 1642, discovering that some parents and masters were failing rightfully to perform their duty, the Puritan church sought the help of the State to assist them in seeing that parents and masters did not shirk these duties. The Massachusetts Law of 1642 ordered the officials of each town to discover whether parents and masters were faithful to their educational responsibilities, whether all the children were being trained "in learning and labor and other employment profitable to the Commonwealth," and being taught "to read and understand the principles of religion and the capital laws of the country." The officers had the power to assess fines on those who failed in these duties. "This law of 1642," says Dr. Cubberley, "is remarkable in that, for the first time in the English-speaking world, a legislative body representing

[13]*Ibid.*, p. 15.

the State ordered that all children should be taught to read. This was a distinctively Calvinistic contribution to our new-world life, a contribution of large future importance." This law governed the education in the home and under the master.

In 1647 the State directed that every town having fifty householders must employ a teacher and pay the salary the town might fix and that every town of one hundred householders must provide a Latin School to fit youth for college. Failure to do so would invoke a penalty of five pounds. "For the first time among English-speaking people," says Dr. Cubberley, "there was the assertion of the State to require communities to establish and maintain schools, under penalty of a fine if they refused to do so."

"We boast of our common schools," said the historian George Bancroft (1800-1891). "Calvin was the father of popular education, the inventor of the system of free schools. We are proud of the free States that fringe the Atlantic. The pilgrims of Plymouth were Calvinists; the best influence in South Carolina came from the Calvinists of France. William Penn was the disciple of the Huguenots; the ships from Holland that first brought colonists to Manhattan were filled with Calvinists. He that will not honor the memory, and respect the influence of Calvin, knows but little of the origin of American liberty."[14]

A searching piece of work was done by Donald G. Tewksbury in his book *The Founding of American Colleges and Universities Before the Civil War*. His study covers a confused, neglected, and highly significant phase of our social, civil, cultural, and religious history. He has gone back to original sources, clearly documents his statements, and makes clear his presentations.

---

[14]George Bancroft, *Literary and Historical Miscellanies* (Harper & Brothers, 1857), p. 406.

An American Institution

Dr. Tewksbury declares: "The American College was typically a frontier institution. It was designed primarily to meet the needs of pioneer communities, and was established in most cases on the frontier line of settlement. The frontier conditions under which Harvard, the earliest of American colleges, was founded were reproduced on each successive line of settlement across the continent. In the course of the westward expansion of the American people, as the force of frontier life gained a cumulative power, a distinctive American institution arose shaped and adapted to the peculiar needs of an advancing people."

The work was started and carried on by the Church and its ministers. The institutions of higher education departed radically from the European institutions of higher education and acquired characteristics and functions which made the college a distinctive American institution whose benefits are open to all. Dr. Tewksbury adds: "Attempts made at various times to modify or transform this institution so that it would be more in accord with French and German patterns in higher education were successfully resisted before the time of the Civil War. Numerous statements from contemporaneous sources testify to the fact that our colleges and universities were being shaped and molded by the forces of American life into truly native institutions of higher education."[15]

In the period from 1636 to 1769 nine American colleges were founded which are still functioning. All of these had behind them the Christian aim and support and were brought into being largely by ministers to serve the Church, and through the Church to serve their own generation. They

---

[15]Donald G. Tewksbury, *The Founding of American Colleges and Universities Before the Civil War* (Bureau of Publication, Teachers College, Columbia University, 1932), p. 2.

were in a sense vocational in their outlook, and centered in the Church, but had a broad, deep purpose of serving the entire social order.

Over one of the entrances of the first college, Harvard (1636),[15a] is carved in the granite *Pro Christo et Ecclesia,* "for Christ and the Church." This college was started by a gift of some books and four hundred pounds from a Congregational minister, Rev. John Harvard, from whom the institution took its name, and all of its earlier presidents were ministers.

William and Mary (1693) was the second college—founded by the Anglican Church in Virginia. The Puritans founded their second college, Yale (1701), in Connecticut. The Presbyterians founded first the Log College (1729-1746), under William Tennant, and later Princeton (1746), formerly the College of New Jersey, which was the fourth permanent college. Columbia (1754), formerly King's College, was the fifth college—erected by the Anglican Church in New York. Next came the early stages of the University of Pennsylvania (1755). One of its scholarly professors, Dr. Robert Ellis Thompson, declared:

"From the foundation of Harvard College onward, it was the Church's conviction of the need of a learned ministry, and the Church's possession of scholarship in its ministry, which made the propagation of a taste for the higher culture possible to America. Even my own university, the first in America without definite denominational connection, owed to the Christian ministry both the ablest of its teachers and the bulk of its students, and it recognized its close relations to the churches by giving the senior minister of each denomination a seat in its board of trustees, while the city churches every year took up a collection for its support."[16]

[15a]The date of "founding" given in this chapter is the date on which the legal right to confer degrees was granted to the institution.

[16]Robert Ellis Thompson, *The Divine Order of Human Society* (Jno. D. Wattles, 1891).

The seventh college, Brown (1765), was founded by the Baptists in Rhode Island. The eighth was Rutgers (1766), founded by the Dutch Reformed Church (Reformed Church in America) in New Jersey. The ninth, Dartmouth (1769), was founded by the Congregational Church in New Hampshire.

Princeton (with its forerunner the Log College) and Yale have each been called "the Mother of Colleges." Certainly many streams of missionary and evangelistic influence went out through the West from these two institutions. The Congregationalists issuing forth from Yale were instrumental in establishing not less than sixteen colleges before the War Between the States. Dr. J. H. Patton, in *A Popular History of the Presbyterian Church of America,* claims that twenty-five colleges in the United States owe their existence to men sent out from Princeton.

To recount what the institutions of higher education, with their high ideals of intellectual, moral, and Christian ideals did and continue to do for the cultural and religious development of the citizens of our growing nation would require many volumes.

In the period from 1780 to 1799 sixteen more colleges were founded which continue to exist. Six of these were established by Presbyterians, viz: Washington and Lee (1782), Hampden-Sydney (1783), Transylvania (1783), Dickinson (1783), Tusculum (1794), and Union (1795); one by the German Reformed Church (Reformed Church in the United States), Franklin and Marshall (1787); two by the Congregational: Williams (1793) and Bowdoin (1794); and three by the Episcopal Church: Washington (1782) and St. Johns (1784) in Maryland, and Charleston (1785). Dr. Tewksbury adds: "It will be noted that six of these colleges were founded by the Presbyterian Church which had emerged as the dominant Church

of the Revolutionary period. In some of these denominational colleges, e.g., Hampden-Sydney and Dickinson, the newer ideals of political liberty and secular culture were to some extent reflected, but in the main they were religious in design and purpose."[17] Of the sixteen colleges, four were state or semistate institutions, viz: Georgia (1785), North Carolina (1789), Vermont (1791), and Tennessee (1794).

Of the 207 colleges founded before the War Between the States which are in existence today, Donald G. Tewksbury, after careful research, declares that the Presbyterians founded 49; the Methodist 34; the Baptist 25; the Congregational 21; the Catholic 14; the Episcopal 11; the Lutheran 6; the Disciples 5; the Reformed Church U. S., 4; the Universalist 4; the Friends 2; the Unitarian 2; the Christian, Reformed Church in America, and the United Brethren, 1 each. 3 were semistate, 3 municipal, and 21 state institutions.

Dr. Tewksbury names seven denominations that were opposed to the ideal of a highly educated ministry during the early years of their history, and were late in the field of higher education. He adds another statement that explains why some of the churches named soon outstripped the Congregational and Presbyterian in numbers: "In the cases of these denominations, evangelical fervor was more highly regarded than learning or scholarship. Thus the main incentive for a program of college building was absent. An active prejudice existed, moreover, among these denominations against colleges and collegiate training . . . The Presbyterian Church was more closely identified with the development of institutions of higher education in America than any other Church in the period before the Civil War. One of the most pronounced characteristics of this Church was its

[17] *Ibid.*, pp. 61-62.

uniform and ardent zeal in behalf of an educated ministry. This ideal of a highly educated ministry formed a part of its Calvinistic heritage from Europe."[18]

A "Plan of Union" was adopted in 1802 by the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church and the Congregational Association recognizing plans of harmonious co-operation which were begun in the year 1794. The preaching and the methods of work were so similar between these Calvinistic bodies that it was felt that ecclesiastical forms should be held subordinate to Christian effort as they faced serious questions which immediately affected the destiny of the country. The chief motive in this co-operation was to secure the needed ministers for the rapidly developing country and to provide suitable education for the youth. Under the "Plan of Union" of 1802 and the co-operation which continued with the "New School" Presbyterian Church, seven colleges were founded jointly by Congregational and Presbyterian Churches: Knox (1837), Beloit (1846), Grinnell (1847), Rockford (1847), Ripon (1851), Milwaukee-Downer (1850), and Pacific University (1854). The "Old School" Presbyterian Church withdrew from the "Plan of Union" in 1837. The "New School" continued the agreement until 1861. The "New School" and the "Old School" were reunited in 1869 and became the Presbyterian Church in the United States of America. The Presbyterians of the South withdrew in 1861 and formed the Presbyterian Church in the United States.

In the Other Colonies

The vast difference which appeared in the ideals and plans for education in New England and in the South is

---

[18]Donald G. Tewksbury *The Founding of American Colleges and Universities Before the Civil War* (Teachers College, Columbia University, 1932), pp. 90-91.

explained partly from the fact that while the populations were practically from the same English stock they came to the new continent largely from different motives. The New England settlers were largely Dissenters from the Church of England and came to America to obtain freedom in religious worship, while many of the leaders among the settlers in Virginia still adhered to the Established Church of England and came chiefly for material ends. The latter naturally fell into the customary English practices of education and failed to establish Colonial schools. The aristocratic families had a tutor in the home or patronized small private pay schools, while the poor had the advantages that apprenticeship or charity schools might provide.

Governor Berkeley reported in 1671 for Virginia: "I thank God there are no free schools nor printing, and I hope we shall not have these hundred years; for learning has brought disobedience, and heresy, and sects in the world, and printing has divulged them, and libels against the best government. God keep us from both."

A great contest was raised during the first half of the nineteenth century between those who desired the extension of the public schools and those who opposed such a movement. After reading the biographies and histories of men and movements from 1800 to 1850 one can readily understand the analysis of the contending forces made by E. P. Cubberley and is compelled to accept in a very general way his conclusions. He lists "roughly" the following as *for* public schools: (1) " 'Citizens of the Republic,' (2) philanthropists and humanitarians, (3) public men of large vision, (4) city residents, (5) the intelligent working men in the cities, (6) non-tax payers, (7) Calvinists, and (8) 'New England Men.' " He states that the alignment *against* public schools was about as follows: "Men considered as (1) belonging to the old aristocratic class, (2) the con-

servatives of society, (3) politicians of small vision, (4) residents of rural districts, (5) the ignorant, narrow-minded, and pernicious, (6) tax payers, (7) certain churches, (8) Southern men, (9) proprietors of private schools, and (10) the non-English-speaking classes."[19]

Many of these groups approached this important matter from different standpoints. Each reflected, to some extent, a background in some instances reaching back to their fathers' father. Many were intelligent and sincere in their contentions while they were doubtless wrong in their conclusions. In facing the serious problems today let no one be too sure that all the right is on his side. Try to keep free from prejudice.

Dr. Charles W. Dabney gives a vivid picture of how the development of systems of free public schools had been hindered by the aristocratic organization of society before the War Between the States. He says, "Nowhere in the South except in North Carolina and Kentucky was there anything remotely like a system of schools before 1860."[20] As late as 1876 a fierce conflict was waged between those who held the Jeffersonian view of popular education and those who held the aristocratic view. Dr. Dabney illustrates this by the controversy between his father Dr. Robert Lewis Dabney, who was a professor in Union Theological Seminary and had served as Chief of Staff for General Stonewall Jackson, and William H. Ruffner who led in the founding of the public school system of Virginia. Referring to the aristocratic view of his father, inherited by the people of the Old Dominion from England, Dr. Charles Dabney writes, "In Dabney's mind a system of free public schools was just a part of a

---

[19]Ellwood P. Cubberley, *The History of Education* (Houghton Mifflin Co., 1920).

[20]Charles W. Dabney, *Universal Education in the South* (Univ. of N. C. Press, 1936), Vol. I, p. 31.

vicious scheme to destroy completely the last trace of that old civilization."[21]

The Church had well-thought-out reasons for its work in education. The Christian religion makes its appeal both to the intellect and to the emotions. Education is, therefore, an essential element. If God is sovereign the minds of people must be developed that they may understand something of His thought and His work and His Word. Not only did the Presbyterian Church seek to provide education for its own youth, but it opened its schools to others and prepared teachers for private and public schools, high schools, and colleges of our land and of the world. The Church has shown its dependence on education that is sane and complete.

[21] *Ibid.*, p. 154.

CHAPTER II

THE STATE ENTERS EDUCATION

IN the colonial period of America's history the support and control of all education was largely in the hands of the Church. Where there was an "established" church no questions were raised. Ten of the thirteen colonies had an established religion. The Anglican or Episcopal faith had been declared "the established religion" in seven of these and the Congregational in three, while three colonies had declared for religious freedom. The Constitutional Convention had many weighty matters before it, not the least of which was that of education and religion and their relation in a democracy to each other.

The solution worked out was "revolutionary" and of far-reaching effects. A provision in the Constitution guaranteed to all free exercise of their faith and forbade the establishment by Congress of any state religion, or the requirement of any religious test or oath as a prerequisite for holding any office under the Federal Government. Although there was no mention of education in the Constitution the foundation was laid for our system of free common schools supported by tax, under state and local control.

Fears and Contests

As the states assumed more and more authority and responsibility for education there were grave fears in the hearts of many Catholics, and some of the Protestant denominations also became deeply concerned. Soon some of the states assumed unusual powers. The state of New Hampshire sought to take over the control of Dartmouth College, which had been established by Congregationalists in 1769. The case was decided by the state court in favor of the state.

An appeal was argued before the Supreme Court of the United States with matchless logic and eloquence by Daniel Webster. The contention of the college was sustained. The effect of this decision had two important and permanent effects. "On the one hand," says Ellwood P. Cubberley, "it guaranteed the perpetuity of endowments, and the great period of private and denominational effort now followed. On the other hand, since the states could not change charters and transform old establishments, they began to turn to the creation of new state universities of their own."[1]

The general acceptance of the civic duty of education was surprisingly slow. George Washington had said: "Knowledge is in every country the surest basis of public happiness. In one in which the measures of government receive their impression so immediately from the sense of the community as in ours, it is proportionably essential." And Thomas Jefferson had declared: "If a nation expects to be ignorant and free in a state of civilization, it expects what never was and never will be." And the first chief justice of the United States, John Jay, had given his judgment: "I consider knowledge to be the soul of a republic, and as the weak and wicked are generally in alliance, as much care should be taken to diminish the number of the former as of the latter. Education is the way to do this, and nothing should be left undone to afford all ranks of people the means of obtaining a proper degree of it at a cheap and easy rate."

And yet as late as 1885 there were 97,000 students in private and church high schools and academies and only 35,000 in public high schools of the United States. Twenty years later, in 1905, the private and church-related academies had an enrollment of 101,000, an increase of 4,600; while the public high schools had 722,000 students, an in-

[1]Ellwood P. Cubberley, *Public Education in the United States* (Houghton Mifflin Co., 1934), p. 206.

crease of 687,000. For every hundred thousand of population in the United States in 1885 there were 234 high school students, of whom 171 were in private or church institutions and only 63 in public. In 1905 there were 985 to the hundred thousand of population, of whom 121 were in private or church academies and 861 in public high schools.

This nation can never forget its debt to the churches. The church-related academy led the way, prepared the leaders, awakened the mind of the nation. It was not repudiated, but honored, by its adoption as an institution of the states. It was the trailmaker, the road builder, the inspirer, the guide, the example. Opposition to the public school came from many groups—racial, social, economic, geographic, and personal. Some seem to think it was the ecclesiastic alone.

George Washington earnestly advocated a national university to be located at the seat of the national government. President John Adams in his inaugural address grew enthusiastic in praise of the states: "The wisdom and generosity of the Legislatures in making liberal appropriations in money for the benefit of schools, academies, and colleges, is an equal honor to them and their constituents; a proof of their veneration for letters and science, and a portent of great and lasting good to North and South America, and to the world. Great is truth, great is liberty, great is humanity —and they must and will prevail."

The practice of making "land grants" for the promotion of education, begun by the government in 1785, was continued. Between that year and 1862 almost 140,000,000 acres had been set aside for school purposes.

In 1862 a great movement for the establishment of agricultural and mechanical colleges was started. "The need of bringing a more practical education than that furnished by

the ordinary classical college was felt. With the view of bringing education into closer relation with the mechanical arts and the agricultural development of our vast domain, Congress made a grant of land-script to the amount of 30,000 acres for each senator and representative for the establishment of what are known as agricultural colleges."[2] For this purpose 9,510,000 acres were donated to the several states.

Our Public Education

The public schools of the United States now present the largest effort ever made in the history of the world to give an education to all the children of all the people of a country. They are constantly growing in number, in influence, and in efficiency along many lines. Year by year they assume larger responsibility for the physical, mental, and social development of the boys and girls. The influence of the teachers and the associations of the school are of broad and lasting significance. The school receives the children at a very early age, when they are growing rapidly in body and in mind, at a period when they are susceptible to all kinds of influences and impressions. The children are in the school for a large part of their waking hours; they are taught by teachers, some of whom reveal more sympathy and understanding and are more capable than some of the parents. The entire personality of the child—physical, intellectual, moral, and spiritual—receives an impression which helps to mold the character, and determine the future happiness and usefulness of life. Habits are formed, ideals are accepted, purposes are awakened, and destinies are fixed. S. T. Dutton said: "The modern school, because of its wide range of activities and the appeal which it makes to all sides of the child's nature, is more influential even than the home in establishing those

[2]F. V. N. Painter, *A History of Education* (D. Appleton & Co., 1905), p. 388. By permission of D. Appleton-Century Co.

habits which give poise and stability to character and which determine the economy and efficiency of living."

The people of the United States have faith in their public schools and support them because they believe they nourish and safeguard our liberties and prepare our children to make a better living, and fit them for creative citizenship. The latest available statistics of public education in the United States are for the year 1935-1936. The following record is condensed from *School Life,* June, 1938, page 355; and November, 1938, page 44.

There were enrolled in the elementary schools: under public control 20,477,964 students; under other control, 2,271,387—a total of 22,749,351. In high schools: public, 6,016,883; other, 415,131—total 6,432,014. In colleges and universities: public, 614,131; other, 594,096—total 1,208,227 (about 1,540 institutions of higher education reporting). In other schools for Indians, nurses, business, etc., were a total of 173,196 students, making a total of 30,562,788 enrolled in the educational institutions of the United States.

There were graduated from the high schools, 1,015,345; and from the colleges and universities (including only first degree—not master's or doctor's degrees), 143,125.

In all the grades of schools and high schools were 265,355 men teachers and 802,128 women teachers—a total of 1,067,483. In the colleges and universities were 110,225 professors.

The total amount of income reported for public institutions (which includes public funds, student fees, gifts, etc.) was $2,476,969,888; other institutions $410,944,721—making a total of $2,887,914,609. These figures do not include $47,038,548 "nonexpendable" funds received for increasing permanent funds.

The total amount reported as spent in public institutions

was $2,232,235,236; in other institutions $417,678,787—making a total of $2,649,914,023. These figures do not include Federal or Territorial expenditures for schools in Alaska, amounting to $1,368,241.

The value of land, buildings, and equipment of all institutions reporting, $10,115,744,000; total endowment and other trust funds reported, $2,237,340,000—a total of $12,353,084,000.

Meeting Growing Needs

Since 1800 the common school education in the United States has passed gradually into the control of the State. The schools of the Church were not numerous enough to reach all the children of all the people. Rivalries arose among the various churches and new and aggressive divisions came into being. Class distinctions appeared, waves of French infidelity swept over the country, bitter controversies arose; charges of the "unwarranted intrusion of religious sects" into the field of education and of the presumption and danger of "godless schools," inflamed the passions and warped the judgment even of many good men and true.

Floods of immigrants, largely illiterate and lacking in self-control and personal initiative, were sweeping into the country, many coming from the south of Europe where the ideals and manner of thought and of life were farthest from the civilization into which they were hurled. The United States government in 1820 began to keep a record of aliens coming into this country. In 1820 the number of immigrants was 8,385, in 1837 it had increased to 79,340, and in 1860 to 153,640; while in the years 1905, 1906, 1907, 1910, 1913, 1914 the admissions of foreigners greatly exceeded one million each year. At all times it has been recognized that this vast number of people must be Americanized and educated in the ideals and purposes of the Republic. It was a

great task to develop out of the people from many nations, races, tongues, ideals, customs, and manner of life a unified, effective nation—*E pluribus unum.*

In order to make education accessible and acceptable to all its citizens the Government has found it necessary to establish, maintain, and control schools, colleges, and universities in ever-increasing numbers. In 1785 the Congress made the first land grant for school purposes and the control of education was vested in the states and the local communities. Since that time state aid to education has been an acknowledged principle in the United States.

The great hopes expressed in the early days of our history about the salutary effects of education were based on the conception of education permeated with religion.

In 1796, George Washington in his farewell address said: "Promote, then, as an object of primary importance, institutions for the general diffusion of knowledge. In proportion as the structure of a government gives force to public opinion, it is essential that public opinion should be enlightened."

But Washington was not thinking of education apart from the sanctions of religion. He declared: "Of all the dispositions and habits which lead to political prosperity, Religion and Morality are indispensable supports. In vain would that man claim the tribute of Patriotism who should labor to subvert those pillars of human happiness, those firmest props of the duties of Men and Citizens. The mere Politician, equally with the pious man, ought to respect and to cherish them. A volume could not trace all their connections with private and public felicity. Let it simply be asked, Where is the security for property, for reputation, for life, if the sense of religious obligation desert the oaths which are the instruments of investigation in Courts of Justice? And let us with caution indulge the supposition that morality can be maintained without religion. Whatever may be con-

ceded to the influence of refined education on minds of peculiar structure, reason and experience both forbid us to expect that national morality can prevail in exclusion of religious principle."

Daniel Webster uttered these words, which have been emblazoned on the wall at the entrance of the Public Library of New York City: "Upon the diffusion of education among the people rests the preservation and perpetuation of our free institutions." He knew nothing of a secularized education, but put his hope in the enlightening and strengthening power of the Christian religion.

Not only was this the thought of the leading citizens in the early days, but it was clearly expressed by the Government. On the 13th day of July, 1787, the Confederated Congress, composed of delegates appointed by each state in the United States of America under the Articles of Confederation, passed what was known as the *Northwest Ordinance* for the government of the territory of the United States northwest of the Ohio River. By the authority vested in them, and for the purpose, as they expressed it, of "extending the fundamental principles of civil and religious liberty which formed the basis whereon these republics, their laws and constitutions, are erected," they did ordain, as follows:

"Religion, morality and knowledge being necessary to good government and the happiness of mankind, schools and the means of education shall be encouraged." (Art. 3.)

Expectations Not Fully Realized

And yet with all this effort and growth and expenditure of money all is not well.

When education passed largely out of the hands of the Church there gradually arose a problem which has increased as the years go by. When there came a complete separation of Church and State it became increasingly difficult to supply

religious nourishment for the minds and lives of the boys and girls. Many thoughtful men early saw the danger of this. Daniel Webster earnestly pleaded that to "the three R's" of education a fourth should be added, Religion. In 1898 Dr. Nicholas Murray Butler, after speaking of the folly of those who contended that religion was mere superstition, added: "These contentions seem to me to arise from simple ignorance, alike of history and of human nature. There is a response from the human heart and from the recorded thoughts and deeds of civilized men, based neither on credulity nor on fear, to the description of Hegel that 'religion is for our consciousness that region in which all the enigmas of the world are solved, all the contradictions of deeper reaching thought have their meaning unveiled, and where the voice of the heart's pain is silenced—the region of eternal truth, of eternal rest, of eternal peace.' "

A Necessary Element

Speaking further about the irreparable loss that must come to life if the religious elements are excluded Dr. Butler says: "It must devolve upon the family and the church, then, to give this instruction to the child and to preserve the religious insight from loss. Both family and church must become much more efficient, educationally speaking, than they are now, if they are to bear this burden successfully. This opens a series of questions that may not be entered upon here. It is enough to point out that the religious element of human culture is essential; and that by some effective agency, it must be presented to every child whose education aims at completeness or proportion."[3]

---

[3]Nicholas Murray Butler, *The Meaning of Education* (The Macmillan Co., 1900), pp. 30-31. Used by permission.

A Serious Indictment

In 1907 Paul Monroe called attention to the significance of the change that had taken place and challenged the home and the Church to thought and action:

"The complete secularization of schools has led to the complete exclusion of religious elements in public education and the very general exclusion of the study or even the use of the Bible and of all religious literature. Thus the material that a few generations ago furnished the sole content of elementary education is now entirely excluded and the problem of religious education is presented. Little attempt at solution is being made and little interest seems to be aroused. The problem for the public school teachers comes to be quite similar to that presented by the Greek philosophers, to produce character through an education that is dominantly rational and that excludes the use of the supernatural or religious element. For our schools we have definitely rejected revealed religion as a basis of morality and seek to find a sufficient basis in the development of rationality in the child. Thus one most important phase of education is left to the church and the home, neither of which is doing much to meet the demand."[4]

There has been one saving element in our public education—thousands of the teachers in our schools, high schools, and universities have been devoted Christian women and men. There has radiated from them the spirit of Jesus Christ. Their lives have testified to the power of God.

Other Warnings

In 1912, R. Reeder wrote: "At each step in the elimination of religious instruction from public schools, society has assumed increased risk. Public elementary education is

[4]Paul Monroe, *A Brief Course in the History of Education* (The Macmillan Co., 1907), p. 402. Used by permission.

the extension downward of the nation's authority by moral suasion. It is the peaceful arm of the police system before it has become necessary to display the blue coat and brass buttons. The only rational and adequate means within the power of a democracy to conserve and perpetuate herself, her laws and her institutions, is through public education. We are expending immense sums of money trying to correct grievous ills by legislation. This is attempting to effect social uplift by throwing our weight on the short arc of the lever. It is a thousand times better to form than to reform. The children of today make the state of tomorrow. Nine tenths of these children receive their education in the public elementary schools. Character by culture through education instead of by laws and penalties should be the aim of society. An education which is not moral is unsafe both for the individual and for the state."[5]

In an address at the meeting of the National Education Association at Los Angeles, in 1907, Mr. Clifford W. Barnes, Chairman of the Executive Committee of the International Committee on Moral Training, said: "Generally speaking, systematic moral instruction may be said to have no place in our American school system, for it has only been tried to a very limited extent in a few small places." In commenting on this statement in 1912, Mr. Reeder said: "It is not difficult to see why our public schools have made such indifferent progress in the teaching of morality during the past fifty years. The deterioration of the home as a center of moral influence during the same period is also easily accounted for. Our public school system was established as an adjunct to the home and the church at a time when both of these institutions stood for much more in the life of the

[5]R. Reeder in "Social Aspects of Moral Training," in *Social Aspects of Education,* Irving King, editor (The Macmillan Co., 1912), p. 400. Used by permission.

child than they do today. It was established at a time when the child was much less a ward of the state than he is today, when life was rural, and homes were houses and lands, with firesides and gardens, not tenement boxes: when the course of study was rich in the literature of moral and religious truth; when religion was potent in the home, parental authority was unquestioned, and the church and the minister functioned largely in every community." After speaking of the changes wrought by the crowding into the cities, the problem of the laborer in industry, with the accompanying weakening of home influence and the inflow of foreigners in such large numbers, Mr. Reeder continued: "While only a passive agent in the moral deterioration of the home resulting from these social, economic and industrial changes, the state has been an active agent in the elimination of religious instruction from the public school. Moral instruction in the earlier period of education in this country was inseparably bound up with religious instruction. But through the gradual drawing away of the public schools from church influence, the function of the teacher as a monitor in religious truth, as such, excluded from the classroom, the whole situation is secularized to such an extent as to effect almost a complete elimination of religious instruction from public education. This condition has forced a schism between religious and moral instruction, and left the latter swinging in the air. Whether the state could have done otherwise, and yet safeguarded in the public schools our American ideals of freedom of conscience and religious liberty, is a question. Our only purpose here is merely to call attention to the fact. Whatever may be true of the ability of the mature mind to form moral conceptions and act upon moral grounds independent of religious feeling or of the consciousness of a Supreme Being, it is certainly true

that such ethical abstractions do not appeal to the child mind."[6]

Who Is to Blame?

Many thoughtful, loyal, Christian students believed this situation might have been avoided. Dr. Robert Ellis Thompson, while a professor in the University of Pennsylvania, wrote in 1891: "What we ask to have taught in the schools is not the sectarian peculiarity of this or that party, but the commonly accepted faith of the American people. The entire success of the English Board Schools in sundering these two things proves that there is no impossibility, and hardly any difficulty, in keeping out sectarianism while teaching Christianity. Indeed we have no better statement than that of Professor Huxley, in a letter he wrote to the rector of St. Mary's Church in Bryanstone Square, London, when he was a candidate for a seat in the London School Board: 'I hold that any system of education which attempts to deal only with the intellectual side of a child's nature, and leaves the rest untouched, will prove a delusion and a snare, just as likely to produce a crop of unusually astute scoundrels as anything else. In my belief, unless a child be taught not only morality, but religion, education will come to very little. I believe further, that in the present chaotic state of men's thoughts on these subjects, the only practical method of not altogether excluding religion from the education of the masses is to let them read the Bible, and permit the many noble thoughts and deeds mirrored there to sink into their hearts.' "[7]

Increasingly the gulf between the Church and the State in the field of education has widened, and consequently the

---

[6]*Social Aspects of Education,* Irving King, editor (The Macmillan Co., 1912), p. 401. Used by permission.

[7]Robert Ellis Thompson, *The Divine Order of Human Society* (John D. Wattles, 1891), pp. 186-187.

exclusion of the religious element from the school has grown. In large measure the Church is responsible for this state of affairs.

"In the presence of many religious denominations holding diverse views on what they regarded as fundamental principles, whose equal rights were guaranteed by the constitution," says William H. Larrabee, "it was found impossible to provide systematic religious instruction without conflict with the conscientious convictions of some of them, and the effort was abandoned. For a time the plan was adopted in some of the states of distributing the school moneys among all the schools, public, private and denominational, in the district, according to the number of pupils they reported; but this has been generally abandoned under the more complete development of the public school system, and the rule now prevails that public moneys shall be applied only to schools supported exclusively by the state."[8] The Protestant Church in America is in full accord with this principle as to the use of public funds.

"The formal separation of church and state," declare two noted educators, "while permitting the freer and more effective development of public institutions, including education, has nevertheless favored a certain amount of separateness and lack of co-ordination which is inconsistent in an age which boasts itself that bigotry and narrowness have been largely put aside. One supreme fact, simply stated, is the church needs the school more than ever, and the school needs the church more than ever. The church is employed in the work of saving and uplifting men and women and instructing them in the highest ideals of service, sacrifice, and faith. The school also finds its truest mission in seeking

[8]From Larrabee's "Education through the Agency of Religious Organizations"—a monograph found in Butler's *Education in the United States*. Used by permission of American Book Company, publishers.

moral development, and training mind and heart for the higher forms of service. But the church, being somewhat restrained and impeded by the restriction of ancient forms, has been slow in allying itself with state education, on the ground that it has gone far afield from the doctrines of the fathers and is neglecting to train the conscience toward the dictates of religion. The school, on the other hand, while manned and served by the devotees of religion, goes on doing its work of moral reform, yet wondering why the church is so unappreciative of its work. The difficulty is much more than skin deep. The tenets of a particular faith are esteemed as of more consequence than those great ideals, which are world-wide and universal, and which should, and no doubt will, in the not-distant future, unite the followers of various creeds as well as workers for human redemption. W. T. Harris, the one-time U. S. Commissioner of Education, in closing a paper read before the International Congress at St. Louis, said: 'Social culture in the form of the church and the school as independent institutions becomes possible only on the basis of the religious world-view of Christianity; and the perennial continuance of the world-view of Christianity, through the special form of social culture which belongs to the church, is a necessary condition presupposed by the forms of social culture intrusted to the school.' "[9]

"It has become a truism," says David Snedden, "that Americans have more faith in education as a means of social conservation and regeneration than they have in political democracy, in religion, or even in economic achievement. Eloquent testimony to this faith would mark every page of any fully told history of the three hundred years of migration and settlement which have made the present

---

[9]Samuel Train Dutton and David Snedden, *The Administration of Public Education in the United States* (The Macmillan Co., 1912), pp. 584-585. Used by permission.

American people. Temples to that faith are to be seen today in the palatial high schools of our cities, and in the massed halls of our state universities. The missionary urge of that faith is shown by the ardor with which voluntary groups promote new expansion of that education—now for better health or vocational education, anon for 'pre-school' schools, or for special schools for 'problem cases.' "[10]

In that notable book by Dr. W. H. P. Faunce, *The Educational Ideal in the Ministry,* you will find this clear call to this most important and fundamental task:

"Here, then, is our national peril—that the supremely important task of our generation will fall between Church and State and be ignored by both. The Church may say, 'Education is no longer in our hands'; the State may say, 'On all religious matters we are silent.' Thus millions may grow up—are actually growing up in America today—without any genuine religious training. It is time, therefore, for Church and School to co-operate, as army and navy co-operate, in defense of our common country."

---

[10]David Snedden, *What's Wrong with American Education* (J. B. Lippincott Co., 1927), p. 19.

CHAPTER III

THE EMPHASIS OF THE CHURCH

THERE are yet many serious problems before our American democracy. Certainly the problems of education have not all been solved. This is a matter of vital concern to every citizen and to every home. Issues of far-reaching importance and vital concern to democracy are pressing hard for solution.

God forbid that darkness shall cover our land, that freedom shall be destroyed, that liberty shall depart from our shores, that the imponderable values and forces of the universe shall be obscured. To this end let no one forget the warning of John Philpot Curran—as true in the light of our own day as when uttered in his speech on *The Right of Election* in 1790: "It is the common fate of the indolent to see their rights become a prey to the active. The condition upon which God hath given liberty to man is eternal vigilance; which condition if he break, servitude is at once the consequence of his crime and the punishment of his guilt."

Educators everywhere are concerned about the moral output of our homes, schools, colleges, and universities. It was never in the mind of our fathers that the vital element of religion should be excluded from American education. As this thing was done, one writer after another sounded out a note of warning. Today thoughtful people all over the world are seeking means to correct the tendency to ignore the deeper springs of action in man and the dynamic needed for freedom and for the abundant life.

It is a time for calm consideration, for earnest prayer, for sympathetic understanding of our own and of other viewpoints, for unselfish, heroic, and devoted co-operation. You who study this message are interested in the Church. How

can the Church make its vital and fundamental contribution? What can the Christian home do to help? What can each loyal, Christian citizen of our democracy do?

The Church

The Church's help will not come in the way many expect it. It will not be spectacular; it will not be superficial; but quiet, pervasive, deep, and penetrating. It will be along the line of clarifying its own message; deepening its own faith; living its own Christlike life. Recognizing the supreme value of the human soul and the limitless power of the living God, the Church will seek to develop men and women of faith and love and sympathy and honor and justice and good will. It will ever keep in mind the great truth: "A good man out of the good treasure of the heart bringeth forth good things."[1] It will magnify the religion of the Bible because it is the religion of experience. It will seek to develop each home in the Household of Faith and to awake all to a new sense of responsibility.

The Church today is divided. There are at present more than two hundred denominations and minor divisions in the United States. Some of the lines of division are not very distinct. On the truths that matter most there is large agreement. Some of the differences are theological and philosophical. Science deals with tangible matter which can largely be seen and handled, weighed and measured. Religion deals with spiritual values and forces. Its conclusions are not open to the same kind of proof nor its conclusions so clearly defined as in the physical sciences. The churches differ as to forms of worship; for some this must be stately and with impressive liturgy, for others it must be simple and democratic. Great emphasis is placed by some on the ordinances

[1]Matthew 12:35.

and ritual; others emphasize the spiritual import of these and pay little attention to the form. The churches differ widely in their forms of government; some are governed by a hierarchy, some by bishops, some by a republican or representative form, while some are apparently a pure democracy. These seem to be great differences, and in some cases they are—differences of thought or theology, of methods, and of machinery.

As long as human nature remains as it is there will doubtless be divisions along all these lines—but on the great essentials the divisions may not greatly interfere with the higher ends of co-operation. The Roman Catholic Church is thought of as a closely knit unit; and yet there is doubtless as great a difference between the various Catholic Teaching Orders, and the divisions in the Orders themselves, such as the Benedictine, Franciscan, Dominican, Jesuit, Piarist, Oratorian, etc., as between many of the Protestant denominations.

The churches should try to show to the world that they can work together for the building of the Kingdom of God on earth. The United States sent a great army overseas during the World War. The army had Divisions but it was not divided. Why cannot the Church be like that? While Harry Pratt Judson was president of the University of Chicago he said in speaking of the Church: "We can hardly fail to agree that, whatever its other ends, it exists here as a force for social betterment. It seeks to make people clean and honest and helpful. It aims to energize the conscience and mellow the sympathies. It tries to surround the young with a pure atmosphere—to educate childhood and youth and those of riper years towards the higher life. It is ready to alleviate suffering and to help those in trouble. Its teachings tend to develop the generosity and public spirit which make our

modern life after all so rich in noble character. All this the church does, or aims to do."[2]

"Whatever happens to the church in its present form," says Dr. Henry Link, "the basic truths of Christianity will survive so long as man and human nature survive; because these truths are the foundations of personality and character. The rediscovery of man through the scientific experiments of psychology is a vindication of the Biblical concept of personality and of the concepts of Christianity." "Thus the Christian concept of personality is the absolute opposite of the scientific concept. Whereas the physical sciences have progressively revealed man's limitations, Christianity forever emphasizes his possibilities. Whereas the mental hygiene movement of medical science increasingly describes people as innocent victims of mental disorders, Christianity long ago described the same disorders as the natural consequences of sin—either the sins of omission or of commission. The doctrine of sin and salvation, so vital a part of Christianity, is but the declaration of faith in man's power to achieve personality, his errors notwithstanding."[3]

The Church's first duty is to lead men to know and to do God's will. The kind of person one becomes depends on his conception of God and His plan for the world.

The Eternal Power

Throughout the ages men have been aware of some power or cosmic urge that touched their lives. Herbert Spencer spoke of "the eternal and infinite Energy from which all things proceed." Matthew Arnold wrote of "an eternal

---

[2]Harry Pratt Judson, *Religious Co-operation* (Religious Education, Vol. IV, No. 3), p. 251.

[3]Henry C. Link, *The Rediscovery of Man* (The Macmillan Co., 1936), pp. 238 and 236. Used by permission.

Power (not ourselves) which makes for righteousness." John Tyndall, with clearer insight, declared: "Standing before this power, this energy, which from the universe forces itself upon me, I dare not do other than speak of a He, a Spirit, a Cause." Paul names this Power the Spirit of God. It is the Divine Personality coming in vital contact with the inner man. It is the relation of God with the individual, which deepens and expands the spiritual life. Herein is the very heart of personal religion.

Men often speak of Christianity as though it were merely a theology or a philosophy offering an explanation of causes and destinies. It is this, but also infinitely more. It is power, God's living power, in the lives of men. In this material world man is in danger of overlooking the part of his nature which is made in God's image and which distinguishes us from the brutes, and of failing to recognize and use the spiritual powers of his being. He must have a care lest he become a materialist in the region of the soul. Help outside himself is needed.

A few months before his death, Michael Pupin, who probably knew more about the mathematical side of electricity than any other man, speaking before a group of scientists concerning the moving power of heat and of electricity, said: "Science admits that the magic of these two primordial powers cannot unaided purge the soul of man and eliminate the poisons which corrupt his spiritual life. Another moving power is sorely needed which can penetrate more deeply than the moving power of even the infinitely minute electrons into the depths of the human heart. This need was recognized nearly 2000 years ago when our Saviour revealed the moving power in the spiritual world and commanded us to love the Lord our God, and to love our neighbor as ourselves. . . . The victorious triumph of the moving power of love which Christ discovered will

be the greatest triumph of the power age." This power was recognized by Paul when he declared: "For the love of Christ constraineth us; because we thus judge, that if one died for all, then were all dead; and that He died for all, that they which live should not henceforth live unto themselves, but unto Him who died for them and rose again."[4] The response of the heart to the cross of Christ gives the only adequate and constant dynamic for life.

God

Faith in the Supreme Being is the only sufficient organizing factor of man's intelligence. Science may continue its triumphant march, man may make discoveries about the universe of which he is a part, knowledge may continue to grow from more to more, but when man loses his belief in the great First Cause, who has planned and wrought this marvelous world, he ever goes far afield.

There are many things about God's world and God's work that the finite man cannot fully understand. He now sees "the baffling reflections as in a mirror."[5] By this he is made humble and ready to accept the great affirmation "In the beginning God"—before all things, creating all things, directing all things, is the living God.

It is an awful thing to call a man an atheist; few have been willing to bear this title. Such an attitude in the past age was chiefly founded on the fallacy that the idea of law in nature excludes the idea of God in nature.

William James, the author of *The Varieties of Religious Experience,* declared: "We and God have business with each other; and in opening ourselves to His influence our deepest destiny is fulfilled. The universe, at those parts of it which

---

[4]II Corinthians 5:14, 15.

[5]I Corinthians 13:12. (From *The Bible,* A New Translation by James Moffatt, Harper & Brothers, publishers.)

our personal being constitutes, takes a turn genuinely for the worse or for the better in proportion as each of us fulfills or evades God's demands."

Dr. Hugh Crichton Miller, one of the psychiatrists of London, says: "It is useless for a person to consider himself an adult while he is still pretending to himself and to the world that he does not know whether there is a God, and is indifferent on the subject. He is far from maturity if he does not know himself well enough to realize that he has got to settle in his mind his own views of the Infinite and to adjust himself to it."

Faith in God

The intellectual approach to God is not alone sufficient. "He that cometh to God must believe that He is and that He is a rewarder of them that diligently seek Him"—with a spirit of trustful dependence and expectant receptivity. He must have the attitude and spirit that marked the life of Moses, of whom we are told, "Like one who saw the King Invisible he never flinched."[6] The emotions, too, must be touched by Him. The first great life principle is declared by Jesus who came to reveal "the nature, the will and the world-purpose of God: 'Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy strength, and with all thy mind.' "[7]

"Love for God," says Abraham Kuyper, "taken in general is still largely love for the idea of God, love for the Fountain of Life, for the Source of all Good, for the Watcher of Israel. But when there echoes in the soul the words, 'I love God'[8] then the idea, the sense, the reality of the Eternal Being becomes personified. God becomes a Shepherd who

---

[6]Hebrews 11:27. (From *The Bible*, A New Translation, by James Moffatt, Harper & Brothers, publishers.)

[7]Luke 10:27.

[8]Psalm 116:1.

leads us, a Father, a Friend—the Lord God of our confidence Who is no longer merely God, but our God." The late President Faunce, of Brown University, said, "It is one thing to cry, 'O God,' in recognition or even in admiration, but quite another thing to cry, 'Thou art my God.' It is, I believe, the exact difference between philosophy and religion."

But the intellect and the emotions are not all that is needed in religion and in life. The will must be determined and aroused to action. "The deepest thing in our nature," wrote William James, "is the dumb region of the heart in which we dwell alone with our willingnesses and our unwillingnesses; in these depths of personality the sources of all our outer deeds and decisions take their rise." It is in these depths that God reaches and changes life. Paul wrote the members of the Philippian Church: "Work out your own salvation with fear and trembling, for it is God who worketh in you both to will and to do His good pleasure."[9] But between God and the soul of man is a single barrier—the will.

God has made man for himself, and even though estranged from the one Fountain of Life—not having life because separated from Him—man can ever feel the presence of the Spirit of God and may be made, by His divine power, a new creature and a partaker of the divine nature. But man is not a machine—a robot. He can bar the gate, close the door, refuse to open the heart and life to Christ and to the power of God. All the moral and spiritual resources of the universe become available in the living Christ. He says, "Behold I stand at the door and knock; if any man will hear my voice and open the door, I will come in to him and sup with him and he with me." He becomes the unseen and ever present Friend. This is a great fact. Religion "is the life of God in the soul of man." "Man is great," says the author of

[9]Philippians 2:12, 13.

Lux Mundi, "not merely because he thinks and can recognize moral relationships and obligations, but chiefly because he was created for union with God, and was destined to find blessedness and perfection in Him alone."

Eloquent words of Drummond were quoted by George Adam Smith in his *Life of Henry Drummond:* "The power to set the heart right, to renew the springs of action, comes from Christ. The sense of the infinite worth of the single soul, and the recoverableness of a man at his worst, are the gifts of Christ. The freedom from guilt, the forgiveness of sins, comes from Christ's cross; the hope of immortality springs from Christ's grave. Personal conversion means for life a personal religion, a personal trust in God, a personal debt to Christ, a personal dedication to His cause. These, brought about how you will, are supreme things to aim at, supreme losses if they are missed. That was the conclusion of all Drummond's doctrine. There was no word of Christ's more often upon his lips than this: 'Abide in Me and I in you, for without Me ye can do nothing.' "[10]

A Philosophy of Life

Behind all the phenomena of life there is a purposeful plan—recognized more clearly as the bounds of knowledge are pushed back.

An eminent scientist discussing the development of man says: "Has he (man) acquired that intelligence through essentially unintelligent processes? We need not give man and his ancestors the credit of developing their own intelligences, but if a human being is not a manifestation of an intelligent design, there is no such thing as intelligence."[11]

---

[10]George Adam Smith, *The Life of Henry Drummond,* p. 8.

[11]Ernest A. Hooton, *Up from the Ape* (The Macmillan Co., 1931), p. 238. Used by permission.

God has a plan for the universe of which man is a part. He has a plan extending throughout all history. He has a purpose for each individual and for the entire human family. He is ever seeking to bring each man and all men under the law of righteousness and to endow them with the treasures of wisdom and of grace.

A clear definite answer to the question, what is the end or purpose of life, what are we here for, is essential for the effective working of democracy, of a system of education, and of the Church.

What is God's plan for me? What ends shall I seek? What part of the world's work does He expect me to do? What is a true philosophy of life? It is of supreme importance that each one find the answer to these questions. Only then can one fulfill his duty in the church, the home, the school, or college or in the political, the social, and the business world. To whom shall we go for light?

Plato declared the aim of education to be: "to develop in the body and soul all the beauty and all the perfection of which they are capable."

Jesus, the Master Teacher whose message and spirit and method have affected the thought of succeeding ages, declared: "I am come that they might have life and that they might have it more abundantly."[12]

His great ideal is outlined in the Sermon on the Mount. In the first part of the fifth chapter of Matthew, He spiritualizes the Ten Commandments in what are called the Beatitudes. These are not "rules" or "a code" to abridge man's liberties or to kill the joy of life—they are enunciations of eternal principles that must be incorporated in life, or sad and awful failure will overwhelm man and society.

God uses people to carry on His work in the world. The prophet Hosea, as he spoke for God, said: "I drew them with

[12]John 10:10.

cords of a man, with bands of love." His plan for the social order centers first in individuals. The religion of Christ is to be extended through the impact of one personality upon another—guided and empowered by the great, supreme Personality.

Man is endowed with a capacity for being brought to perfection. He may be continually made better, receiving perpetual improvement. Indeed, to approach this end should be the master purpose of life. The end of the preaching of Jesus was to make men realize that the purpose of life is to know God's will and to get God's will done in the world.

Building Up One's Personality

Man's first business here is to build up his own personality, with God's help, and then to help others develop their personalities. After Jesus had enumerated the Beatitudes in His Sermon on the Mount, He added: "Ye shall be perfect, even as your Father in heaven is perfect." The Greek word translated *perfect* is *teleios,* which means "brought to its end" or "finished." The imaginative Greeks applied this word to a machine that was complete in all its parts—the assembled product. It calls for the integrated personality, the well-rounded person, with intellect, emotions, and will developed to their proper powers, the one who is fully furnished, firmly rooted in the life of God, and who brings forth in his life the fruits of the life which has its source in Him.

Do not be deceived. You cannot bear a message to others until your life is a message. You cannot *do* something effectively until you *are* something. You cannot regulate the lives of others until by His help you have regulated your own life. Professor Drummond said: "God is for quality, man is for quantity. But the immediate need is not for more of us, but, if I may use the expression, a better brand of us."

All the deeper needs of the world today may be expressed in terms of personality. All must be supplied by men of good will. "Above all, our personal relations and personal ideals must improve," says Dr. Cabot, "else economic reforms will amount to nothing. Things are black; but it is people, not mere things, that make them so. Economic reforms, better hours and wages, will do good if they mirror and accompany an improvement in your character and mine; not otherwise. As fast as we grow more honest, more generous, and more ambitious, we shall make a better industrial system and a new form of government to clothe our larger powers. Meantime, class consciousness, which means class hatred, delays our advance."[13]

Helping Others Build Up Their Personalities

The second purpose of life is to help others build up their personalities. Jesus gave a new meaning to personality and revealed the infinite worth of man. When He had enunciated the life principles in the Sermon on the Mount He told His followers that if these principles were incorporated in their lives and dominated their living they would be the *light* to guide the world in its quest for satisfaction; the *salt* to keep civilization from decay; and later the *yeast* to uplift the social order. What use is light under a bushel? Salt that is not used loses its saltness, and is henceforth "good for nothing." Yeast that does not penetrate the meal grows more sour and becomes offensive. Though the Christian is not of the world he is to be first and last in the world and for the world.

The greatest need of the world today and every day is not for material things but for forces that operate through

[13]Richard C. Cabot, *What Men Live By* (Houghton Mifflin Co., 1914), p. 26.

personality. "It is not technical knowledge," wrote E. S. Martin, editor of *Harper's Magazine,* "that is going to save us; it is increased proficiency in the great province of human relationships. What we need is to learn how men can get along together without trying to destroy one another; how they can learn to share what there is—how distribution can be improved—that is what we must learn in order to be saved."

There is a profound law of mutual aid in the universe. We are here to help each other. This can be done only in a spirit of humility and love. There must be no unseemly scramble for "leadership," but a following of the example of Him who said, " I am among you as He that serveth."[14] No demand of our rights, but a fulfilling of our privileges and opportunities as suggested by the message of Paul to the Galatians: "Brethren, ye have been called unto liberty; only use not liberty for an occasion to the flesh, but by love serve one another."

The scholar, writer, organizer, and president of the University of Chicago, Dr. W. R. Harper, said to Dr. E. D. Burton who succeeded him in the president's chair: "I have never doubted that God had given me a work to do in the world which, if I did not do it, would go undone."

The Bible

The Church believes that no man is truly cultured or educated who is ignorant of the Bible. It holds it true that this Book gives light to guide to the real meaning of life.

The Church, the home, and every Christian seek to give the greatest classic its rightful place. To do this it is necessary to understand what the Bible is. DeQuincey divides all literature into "the literature of knowledge and the lit-

---

[14]Luke 22:27.

erature of power." While the Bible is a book of knowledge, it is pre-eminently a book of power.

The Bible is not a textbook on science, nor a technical treatise on sociology, nor a compilation of isolated texts to be used in bolstering up the theories of men. It is a record of God's revelation to man and of man's response to it. It is a historical record of the search of man for "a safe conduct through life" and for power and for fellowship with the Infinite, and also of the interest revealed by God for man and the help He brings to man. In an introduction to a recent pamphlet on the work of the American Bible Society, Dr. Robert E. Speer says: "The Bible is one of the solid facts of Christianity. What it is is not affected by what men think of it. Changing opinions about the Bible do not change the Bible. Whatever the Bible was the Bible is. And what it is it has always been. It is not men's thoughts about the Bible that judge it. It is the Bible which judges men and their thoughts. It has nothing to fear but ignorance and neglect. And the Church need have no other fear on its account. The Bible will take care of itself if the Church will distribute it and get it read."

No true scientist can ignore the message and the influence of the Bible. It has increasingly become recognized as the universal Book, useful for all people, of all ages, of all lands. It deals chiefly with personality and hence touches human thought and action at every point—personal, civil, political, social, and ecclesiastical. Its fundamental lessons are what man is to believe concerning God and what duty God requires of man.

Tests and reports emphasize the fact that ignorance of the Bible is very prevalent. A dean of one of the largest universities said: "Most of our students are doing post-graduate work, but I do not have words in which to adequately express the lack of knowledge of the Bible on the part of many.

I will merely say their ignorance of the Bible is amazing, colossal and complete."

The Teaching of the Bible and Morals

Creative study has been made of plans to insure the teaching of the Bible and of morals in our public schools. Much diversity of opinion as to the wise course to pursue prevails. (1) Some contend that moral education is not needed as an outside agency or a school course: that the personality of the teacher, the discipline of the school, the formation of correct habits, the formal work in such studies as language, literature, and mathematics will discipline the will to attentiveness, persistence, accuracy, and love of truth; that the life of the school and the spirit of sport and fair play will develop the moral life. These absorb many of the educational ideas of Herbart. They do not give large place to the dynamic of religion. (2) Others contend that moral life can be developed only through definite religious instruction. This is being tried out in some public schools. (3) Others put their hope in agencies for moral training: student self-government, honor systems, George Junior Republics where the pupils assume responsibility, and larger use of playgrounds and recreation centers carefully supervised.

While there is a wide difference of opinion about the use of moral instruction in the public school, there can be no question about the need of such instruction. The Council of Church Boards of Education, the International Council of Religious Education, the Religious Education Association, the National Council on Religion in Higher Education, and other groups are now seriously studying the problem and are seeking a solution.

Of greatest need and hope is the full co-operation of the home and the church. Each should recognize more fully its duty to make more clear and definite its teaching about the

real meaning of life, the sources of light to guide, the thought and purpose, and the limitless resources available to all those who will to do the will of God.

This situation will not be corrected merely by verbal instruction, by mass movements, by speeches and books, by conferences and conventions. These all may help in a fine way. But life must touch life. Faith must show works. Profession must be illustrated by experience. Personal character must win the confidence, secure the approval, and awaken desire in those one would influence and guide.

It is a serious loss to be deprived of the knowledge the Bible offers. No other book is so powerful and complete. Its spirit and imagery and revelation have inspired men in all ranks of life in every country where it has been taken. It is not possible to read the greatest poems and the abiding books of Europe and America and understand their language and illustrations, or to get the message from art or the great oratorios, without some knowledge of these sixty-six books called "The Bible." The power of the Bible lies in the fact that it is pre-eminently a book of life. It was created out of human life, it reflects life, with its ceaseless change and its variety of experiences; it records with great fidelity human sorrow, tragedy, and sin; it recounts the play and interplay of souls, the rise and fall of nations, the aspirations and strivings of man for clearer knowledge of and a closer fellowship with God. Finally through the lawgiver, the prophet, the psalmist, and the Word which was made flesh and dwelt among us, it reveals the Father and His purpose for the universe and His plan for the life of man and shows how men and women throughout the ages have found God or have missed the way to Him. The Bible has given guidance in all the avenues of life.

The Bible's Contribution to Science

The late C. Alphonso Smith, the author and teacher, who served for many years as head of the Department of English in the United States Naval Academy at Annapolis, wrote: "No single chapter in the Old Testament so impresses me as the first chapter of Genesis. This chapter abolished mythology throughout the civilized world. There were doubtless mythological germs among the Hebrews themselves but this chapter sterilized them. Latin, Greek, Norse, and Oriental mythology lived on for a while but the warrant of dispossession had been served and gods and goddesses, demigods, and demigoddesses, naiads, dryads, and hamadryads, all had to go. Some of them found refuge in poetry and romance; some in the ornament and compliment of oratory; some in the metaphors and similes of rhetoric. But in exact proportion as the first great thought of the Bible had free circulation among races and nations, the big gods and the little gods were doomed. Mythology became a mere toy of the mind. The preface to the Bible had throned one God as maker and preserver of all. It served as a sort of cosmic Monroe Doctrine, announcing to the old deities that any attempt on their part to extend their system to any portion of the universe would henceforth be considered dangerous to the well-being of mankind. It had its effect. The dignity and authoritativeness of the announcement, the splendor of the vision that it unfolded, and the instant appeal made to what we now call intuitional probability marked the inauguration of a new era in human thought.

"It is to my mind one of the strangest ironies of history that this first chapter of Genesis should be singled out as distinctively unscientific. It is the one chapter in the Bible that made science possible. It is the *magna charta* of science. There was no science and there could be no science until men recognized that unity, order, and progression are in-

herent in nature's processes. How were men brought to this recognition? Two routes were possible: (1) They could accept the unity, order, and progression of *Genesis* and on this pre-supposition proceed to verification; (2) without knowledge of or belief in *Genesis* they could experiment independently and thus arrive by induction at a knowledge of the orderliness or potential science inherent in nature. Now the history of science proves unmistakably that the first method was that actually followed. The founders of modern science, those on whom the great nineteenth century scientists built, were Bacon, Kepler, Galileo, Harvey, and Newton. These men believed that there was 'mind,' 'thought,' 'Almighty power,' 'design,' 'intelligence,' 'an intelligent Agent' in nature. They believed it not because they had proved it: proof came later. They believed it because *Genesis* affirmed it.

" 'I had rather believe,' wrote Bacon, 'all the legends in the Talmud and the Alcoran than that this universal frame is without a mind.' Kepler said: 'In reading the secrets of Nature I am thinking the thoughts of God after Him.' Kepler was moved to his discoveries, says Benjamin Pierce, 'by an exalted faith, anterior and superior to all science, in the existence of intimate relations between the constitution of man's mind and that of God's firmament.' Galileo believed that his own discoveries would be recognized not only as in harmony with *Genesis* but 'as the most transcendent displays of Almighty power.' Harvey told Robert Boyle that he was led to discover the circulation of the blood by observing that, in the channels through which the blood flows, one set of valves opens towards the heart while another set opens in the opposite direction, and that he could not help believing that 'so prudent a cause as nature had not placed so many valves without a design.' Newton, in his first letter to Bentley, declares that when he wrote the third book of his *Principia* he 'had an eye upon such principles as might work,

with considering men, for the belief of a Deity' and he expresses his happiness that it has been found useful for that purpose. In his second letter to Bentley (January 17, 1692-3) he writes: 'I am compelled to ascribe the frame of this system to an intelligent Agent.'

"When Huxley says, therefore, that 'Science is the discovery of the rational order that pervades the universe,' he states clearly what might have been, what perhaps would have been. In historic fact, however, the founders of science being themselves the judges, 'the rational order that pervades the universe' was not discovered. It was revealed. The discoveries of science made between the years 1600 and 1700—and these laid the foundations for all later science—are, in their last analysis, only verifications, combinations, illustrations, or, better still, acceptations, of the rational order proclaimed for the first time in the first chapter of Genesis."[15]

Science and Religion

There can be no real conflict between true religion and true science. Truth is one; we are a part of a *uni*verse. But some scientists fail to define clearly the terms they use and fall into unscientific modes of thought and expression. It would be difficult to understand fully just what is meant by the following statement and many similar pronouncements: "Science as fundamental knowledge has been the greatest factor in freeing our minds from the preconceptions and superstitions handed down to us through the ages. Our mental attitude has been profoundly modified by our knowledge of the processes of evolution. . . Knowledge not only helps to set us free, but will lead us on to higher things. . . The applications of scientific knowledge have made possible a

[15]C. Alphonso Smith, *Keynote Studies in Keynote Books of the Bible* (Copyright, 1919, by Fleming H. Revell Co., publishers), pp. 34, 38, 39, 45-48.

standard of living undreamed of a generation ago. . . Our greatest hope for future well-being and prosperity lies in further applications of science."[16]

Do these writers mean what they seem to say? Do they really believe that the physical "living undreamed of a generation ago," man's material "well-being and prosperity," and "our greatest hope for the future," can be brought into being by the physical sciences, or that these advancements will "set us free" and "lead us on to higher things"?

Many of the patriotic men of former generations called attention to the absolute need of great spiritual forces: Daniel Webster (1782-1852), in the early years of our nation's life, uttered a prophecy which our own age is testing: "If we abide by the principles taught in the Bible, our country will go on prospering and to prosper; but if we and our posterity neglect its instructions and authority, no man can tell how sudden a catastrophe may overwhelm us and bury all our glory in profound oblivion." Horace Greeley (1811-1872) later declared, "It is impossible mentally or socially to enslave a Bible reading people."

Leading scholars in all the fields of science today are calling attention to the dangers of overlooking the spiritual facts and forces of life. "The enormous advance gained by the sciences of inanimate matters over those of living things," says Dr. Alexis Carrel, "is one of the greatest catastrophes ever suffered by humanity. The environment born of our intelligence and our inventions is adjusted neither to our stature nor to our shape. We are unhappy. We degenerate morally and mentally. The groups and the nations in which industrial civilization has attained its highest development are precisely those which are becoming weaker, and whose return to barbarism is the most rapid. But they do not real-

[16]Irving Langmuir, in address on "Chemical Research," at dedication of the new building of Mellon Institute, 1937.

ize it. They are without protection against the hostile surroundings that science has built about them."[17]

At the close of his book *Science in Search of God*, the Harvard geologist Kirkly F. Mather writes these great words: "There are eternal values in the universe independent of time and space. They transcend time and they are truly eternal. They have quantity as well as quality or reality. When a man becomes aware of these limitless values, he achieves immortality. To do so we must learn to find life in terms of values rather than materials—of non-measurable as well as measurable things. This is life at the divine level."

The Development of the Home

The Church started in the home and homes must ever feed its life. It is, in fact, the extension of the home—the "Household of Faith."

"God setteth the solitary in families," and has made the home, with its ever-lengthening period of dependence and training, the fundamental group of human relationship. The home provides the ideal group. "Its influence is broader and more lasting than that of any other group. It provides and nurtures the individual who functions in the social group. Here the group is small, the location for an extended period is definite, the relations are mutual, the contacts are intimate and constantly repeated. The influence comes to the children while their minds are plastic, their intellects inquisitive, their souls reverent, their trust in parent or older brother or sister implicit, and their ideals real and near and constantly renewed to their minds.

"No other relations of human life are so real and powerful as that of parent and child, brother and sister—the

[17]Alexis Carrel, *Man the Unknown* (Harper & Brothers, 1935), p. 28.

group held together by the ties of blood, of love, of most intimate association, and of mutual dependence. Any trend that weakens these ties and tends to destroy the home is a serious menace to society. The Church will never rise higher than the homes which feed its life; the nation will never be better than the homes which perpetuate its existence. The family is the primal social cell, the very soul and center of all the other groups."[18]

The best part of character is that which is revealed by habits. The home offers the broadest field for moral development. Here in miniature is the whole world. The parents have the opportunity not only to instruct the intellect, to stimulate the best in the emotions, wisely to discipline the will, but to guide the child into helpful and unselfish moral experience and conduct. At this point the school can render most valuable help.

Every wise parent seeks to guide the child into freedom. "Freedom," says Irving King, "is liberty of choice, coupled with sufficient moral self-control to choose the right; for choosing what is wrong results in a limitation of freedom. One is free who does as he pleases, but pleases to do right. Moral training is, therefore, not merely informing the intellect by means of moral standards and ideals, but it is forming the will to choose aright."[19]

Ruskin's idea that education is "leading human souls to what is best and making what is best out of them," should ever have a place in the minds of parents. The home must provide proper food for body, mind, and spiritual being, developing healthy bodies, alert minds, aesthetic appreciation of the true, the beautiful, and the good, high moral ideals, and ethical habits of life.

---

[18]Henry H. Sweets, *Planning the Good Life*, pp. 149-150.

[19]*Social Aspects of Education*, Irving King, editor (The Macmillan Co., 1912), p. 402. Used by permission.

The Father's Influence

Many fathers are either ignorant or careless of the responsibility and opportunity before them. Professor Seeley, author of *Ecce Homo,* declared: "The father has not time to do all that is necessary to be done for his children; part he will do himself, but part must be intrusted to others. He hands over the child's education—his mind, his soul. He reserves to himself the finance department. It is not easy to estimate the mischief produced by this division of labor. I know scarcely any cause from which the community suffers so much. Thus we devolve upon others all that is valuable and dignified in fatherhood, and retain only its burdens and anxieties. What an impoverishment of character and of paternal dignity!" Sad and fatal illustrations of this grievous error may be seen on every hand. A sad cry reaches our ears from the Song of Songs: "They made me keeper of the vineyards, but mine own vineyard have I not kept."[20]

Many who are faithful in the instruction and influence of the home give little thought or planning to the character of the college or technical school to which the members of the household shall go as they leave the home. This is often followed by disastrous results. Many boys and girls are not prepared for the sudden change. Paul called attention to a period that must come in each developing life when he declared: "When I was a child, I spake as a child, I understood as a child, I thought as a child; but when I became a man, I put away childish things."[21] From the prattle of the child, through thought in crude, general notions into consecutive reasoning is the long, weary, and ofttimes bewildering way along which each must go. At this period intelligent, sympathetic teachers who "see life steadily and who see it whole" can be of largest helpfulness. It is not so much what parents

[20]Song of Solomon 1:6.
[21]I Corinthians 13:11.

and teachers say as the spirit and attitude they reveal. Religion is far more than intellectual assent to a creed. It touches all there is to man and every part of his life. Professor Henry Drummond declared: "Christianity is not a thing to be proved, but a life to be lived. But I qualify this also. You men will be wise indeed to find out and study the great doctrines of Christianity. There are doctrines in Christianity as well as in medicine. The authorities are as scientific in method as the most learned scientific observer here. You must search theology as you do other subjects. Go to the experts, not to penny magazines."[22] Youth must be brought to understand these profound truths.

The corporate life and service of the church can bring constructive help. The worship should be warm, reverent, and enlightening. Parents and children are wonderfully helped as they together attend the worship in the house of God. This habit is of utmost importance as a unifying factor in the family. Almost every other organization is divisive—calls the father here, the mother there, the girls to one place, the boys to another. The instruction of the church school has been greatly improved. It should be of the very best. In these days of oppression and of the dictators, the true source of liberty and of union should be sought.

Securing True Freedom

Education which makes men free must be based on a recognition of the purpose and plan of God. A proper sense of relationship to God is essential in all the peaceful relationships of life. The message of Malachi to Israel is searching and profound: "Have we not all one God; hath not one Father made us all? Therefore, why should men deal treacherously one against the other?"[23] Do not misunderstand the

[22]George Adam Smith, *The Life of Henry Drummond*, p. 524.
[23]Malachi 2:10.

oft-quoted words of Jesus. He did not intimate that all truth is liberating. He said: "If ye continue in my word, then are ye my disciples indeed: and ye shall know the truth and the truth shall make you free."[24] The great scholar Saul of Tarsus had this thought in mind when he wrote to Titus about "the Truth that goes with a religious life."[25] The same principle has been embodied in the familiar phrases, "liberal arts," "liberal culture," "liberal education," because such truth frees men from fear, from weakness, from error, from wrong. It gives freedom by illuminating life, nature, duty, and destiny.

"Our educational system has concentrated on mental development and has failed to give any understanding of the way emotional and personality habits are acquired or corrected. The student who emerges from grade school, high school or college without the intelligent conviction that he is the creator of his habits, rather than their victim, is educated for defeat rather than power, for slavery rather than for freedom."[26]

Two Universal Quests

Plato, whose fine spirit and elevated thought have left a lasting impression on each succeeding generation, after describing this quest of man as a sailing over the seas of darkness and doubt on the raft of his own understanding adds, "Not without risk, as I admit, if he cannot find some word of God which will more surely and safely carry him."[27]

In that matchless poem, incorporated as the twenty-eighth

---

[24]John 8:31, 32.

[25]Titus 1:1. (From *The Bible*, A New Translation, by James Moffatt, Harper & Brothers, publishers.)

[26]Henry C. Link, condensed from *Your Life*, Aug. '38, printed in Aug. '38, *Reader's Digest*, p. 20.

[27]The Works of Plato, Selected and Edited by Irvin Edman (The Modern Library, 1928), p. 147.

chapter of the ancient book of Job, the author describes the two great quests in which all men in all ages have been engaged. First, the quest for food and clothing and shelter. He illustrates this in the occupation of the miner, giving a graphic picture (in the revised translation) of mining operations even as they are carried on in this day. With skill and diligence, with dauntless courage and scientific efficiency, man penetrates the depths of the earth and brings forth iron, copper, sapphires, gold. "As for the earth, out of it cometh bread."

But there is another quest. Man does live by bread, but throughout the ages God has sought to make it plain "that man doth not live by bread only."[28] And so the poet cries, "But where shall wisdom be found? And where is the place of understanding?" Before he answers this question he emphasizes the supreme importance of this quest for the spiritual. "Man knoweth not the price thereof." Its value is above the onyx, the sapphire, the coral, the diamond, the ruby, the topaz, the pure gold. Man unaided has never found it. The quest of man alone has never reached a conquest, "seeing it is hid from the eyes of all living." The constant cry of the human soul, often inarticulate, revealed in a restless emptiness, a feverish activity, a haunting longing or fear—as "an infant crying in the night, an infant crying for the light, and with no language but a cry"[29]—is "Oh that I knew where I might find Him!"[30]

At last the answer comes from the Eternal: "And unto man He said, 'Behold the fear of the Lord, that is wisdom; and to depart from evil is understanding.' "[31]

Light and guidance and power, peace and joy and hope, come from religion. Man in all ages has looked for help

[28]Deuteronomy 8:3; Matthew 4:4; Luke 4:4.
[29]Alfred Tennyson, *In Memoriam.*
[30]Job 23:3.
[31]Job 28:28.

outside himself. Bishop Boyd Carpenter, in speaking of the unchanged nature of man in all ages, said: "This being, whose nature is constant in all ages, shows himself to be incorrigibly religious." Sabatier declared: "Man is incurably religious." It is in this soil we must seek to grow a more satisfactory education. Down in the deep secret places of man's nature he may come in touch with the Divine Life and, by that touch, be made to live. Christianity is a religion of power—"the life of God in the soul of man." This is what is expressed in the Bible by the words "eternal life."

All of life may be ruined by the lowering of ideals and the intensive pursuit of things that cannot satisfy. Those are terrible words recorded in the sixteenth Psalm, "And He gave them their request: but sent leanness into their soul."

Apart from God

The Greek word *cosmon,* translated *world* or *cosmos,* is used in the Bible "to express several truths developing from a physical to an ethical sense: (a) arrangement, order; (b) the entire material universe considered as a system; (c) the universe as the abode of men; (d) the human race; and (e) in the ethical sense the sum-total of human life in the ordered world considered apart from, alienated from, and hostile to God."[32] Thus the Bible often uses this word translated "the world" to mean "society organized apart from God."

This does not mean that the Church, which seeks to organize society with God, has withdrawn itself from the great and progressive life of the world, or asks to be counted out of the counsels or plans of men. Against such an idea Tertullian (one of the early Church fathers) protested: "We are not those who live naked and self-exiled in the woods.

---

[32]Marvin R. Vincent, *Word Studies in the New Testament* (Charles Scribner's Sons, 1918), p. 45. (Cf. John 7:7; 15:18; 17:9, 14; I Corinthians 1:20, 21; II Corinthians 7:10; James 4:4.)

We are one people with you. We do not shrink from your life. We are found in your forum, in your market places, in your baths, in your shops, your bridges, your inns, your fairs; we served as soldiers with you and as sailors with you, we were merchants with you, we practiced the same arts and contributed to the same public works." (Apol., cxlii.)

Men fail in life largely because they do not understand their relationship to God and to each other and do not have a true and worthy object and a strong and continuous purpose. An object and end is needed great enough and good enough to draw them away from the trivial and mean things of life, and a purpose strong enough to unite the multiplied thoughts and aspirations and actions of life. What a job we have in building up our own personalities! What a challenge to help others to know and to fulfill the plan of God for their lives!

CHAPTER IV

THE POINT OF VIEW OF THE STATE

IN an address on "Education and Religion" delivered at the fifth quadrennial meeting of the Federal Council of the Churches of Christ in America in Atlanta, Georgia, December 4, 1924, I referred to one of America's problems in education in the following paragraph:

"Another matter that should arouse the Church and the home to a clearer sense of their neglect and of coming danger lies in the fact that in reality some teachers are manufacturing a new religion—or are seeking to erect a scientific scheme to do the work that religion has done and alone can do. The end of this religion is 'socialized democracy.' Its law is an 'ethical code' which will lead to 'scientific morals.' Its deity is reason. Its end is character, achieved by self-reliance, self-culture, self-respect, and self-expression. It gives no place to a living God and no recognition to the moral law. It cultivates the habit of 'looking away from first things, principles, categories, supposed necessities, and of looking only towards last things, fruits, consequences, facts.' To these there is no such thing as the truth. Whatever works is true. Right conduct is that which brings the greatest happiness to the greatest number—every man to count as one. It externalizes life and may snuff out the inner light."

While this statement is true as regards some educators who like King Uzziah "have become strong," it does not do justice to the continued and repeated efforts of many teachers and principals and superintendents to preserve for our generation the ideals, the values, and the spiritual forces made available in the Christian religion.

Increasingly men and women discern that what is needed in Democracy, in Civilization, and in the Church is the

attributes of human personality. Democracy cannot survive without co-operative citizens; Civilization can be held together only by dependable people who will act for the common good; the Church must be made up of men and women who have a spirit of love and an attitude of service, and who live a certain kind of life.

Education is not an end in itself. The knowledge it gives, the grace it bestows, the training it affords, the satisfaction it lends to life, are not its final end. The widening influence for which it prepares, the successes which it insures, and the lasting results in literature or science or life to which it leads are not its great object. "The end and aim of education," declared Dr. Noah Porter, "is the manhood which it forms, the style of character which it produces— and the combined product of intellect and soul, of principles and habits which 'fit a man to perform justly, skillfully, and magnanimously, all the offices, both private and public, of peace and war.' "[1]

The citizens of our nation have not given sufficiently clear and constructive thought to Democracy and its problems. The results of this failure are apparent on every hand. "One great trouble," said John Dewey, "is that we have thought and acted as if our forefathers had found it [Democracy] once for all. We have forgotten that it has to be enacted anew in every generation, in every year and day, in the living relations of person to person in all social forms and institutions."[2]

A careful study of recent publications, based on studies and surveys of human and social conditions and needs, shows clearly that at last the educators have awakened and that the personal element has become the concern of our nation and especially of the educational leaders of the nation and of the states.

[1]Noah Porter, *Educational Systems of the Puritans and Jesuits Compared* (M. W. Dodd, 1851), p. 70.

[2]Article by John Dewey in *The Social Frontier*, May, 1937.

The National Education Association is one of the large and influential organizations of America. The charter of the Association declares: "The purpose and object of this organization shall be to elevate the character and advance the interests of the profession of teaching and to promote the cause of education in the United States."

A volume is printed by the Association each year containing the addresses and proceedings of the annual meeting. It is very enlightening to read in these books the clear, ringing statements of superintendents of education, principals of high schools, and teachers in schools, colleges, and universities revealing their concern about the human element in education, of their disappointment in the ethical output of the school, and of the efforts being put forth to try to overcome the lack of the moral and religious element in education. Careful reading of the books written by experienced educators reveals the fact that practically all of these men and women agree that the purpose of education is not to make smart men and smart women but to make good men and good women—dependable citizens. Many of those who are in public education either state or imply that this is where education needs the handmaid of religion, but add: "We cannot bring religion into the public school because the Church is so divided." Here we face a world-wide anxiety. Thirteen years ago I had an unhurried conference with the head of the Department of Education of the Japanese Empire. He spoke with enthusiasm about the great improvement of the methods of education which had been introduced, of the complete equipment which had been secured for many of their institutions, and of the throngs of students pressing into the high schools and colleges for an education. I then said, "In America we are not wholly pleased with the moral output of our schools." Immediately he replied: "Neither are we. That is where religion ought to come in,

and we can't put religion in our public schools because there are now so many different kinds of religion in the Empire."

Even as early as 1896, Nicholas Murray Butler, of Columbia University, spoke of the loss to public education from the fact that "religious teaching is rapidly passing out of education entirely; and the familiarity with the English Bible as the greatest classic of our tongue, that every cultivated man owes it to himself to possess, is becoming a thing of the past. Two solutions of the difficulty are proposed. One is that the state shall tolerate all existing forms of religious teaching in its own schools, time being set apart for the purpose. The other is that the state shall aid, by money grants, schools maintained by religious or other corporations. Neither suggestion is likely to be received favorably by the American people at present, because of the bitterness of the war between the denominational theologies. Yet the religious element may not be permitted to pass wholly out of education unless we are to cripple it and render it hopelessly incomplete."

Right now many things of far-reaching importance are taking place. The public educators of America are aroused. Plans are being formed, methods are being developed, and organization is being effected which are destined to make rapid and fundamental changes in public education. Possibly never before were such large numbers of educators and organizations enlisted in a similar effort. Co-operating in these studies and plans are the United States Office of Education, the National Education Association, the American Association of School Administrators, and the Departments of Education of the various states.

The Commissioner of Education of the United States recently gave this statement: "Education for democracy means to me that we must bring the problems and the propagandas concerning them into the classroom and the

public forum discussion to be analyzed in an undogmatic, tolerant spirit as the educational basis for social action."[3]

"The success of a democracy is gauged perhaps most completely by the effectiveness and universality of the education of its citizens. The raw material of American democracy in 1938 is the 130 millions of men, women, and children who make up the nation's population. Some 75 million of these are adults. Of these adults, it is estimated that only 2 million are college graduates, 9 million are high-school graduates, 32 million are elementary-school graduates, and another 32 million have not even completed the work of the elementary school. At the last census 4 million of the latter group of adults were totally illiterate—unable to read or write in any language. With this equipment, the American population is required to grapple with complex and vital problems—issues of economic adjustment and equity; delicate issues of foreign policy, peace, or war; problems of amending constitutions, and other problems of an evolving industrial society. In spite of our high ideals, therefore, the American people have never really given a fair trial to a complete education for the entire population as a preventive of social ills and as a method of solving the urgent dilemmas of social adjustment, stability, and progress. The importance of securing public understanding concerning the necessity to demand and support such an educational program can scarcely be overemphasized."[4]

Confusion in Thinking

In the re-examination of the whole educational setup of the country the first point of agreement has been the extraor-

---

[3]J. W. Studebaker, *Education for Democracy*, U. S. Department of the Interior, Office of Education, Bulletin, 1936, No. 6.

[4]Educational Policies Commission, *The Effect of Population Changes on American Education*, January, 1938.

dinary confusion of education geared to democracy as to purpose and end, and the lack of understanding on the part of educators and citizens.

Undoubtedly the obligation of tax-supported schools in a democracy to serve all the people has added greatly to this confusion of purpose. Urging the social aim in education, Albion W. Small said: "This life task of men and women sets the pedagogical task of teachers. The prime problem of education as the sociologist sees it is how to promote adaptation of the individual to the social conditions, natural and artificial, in which individuals live." Communities in which labor predominates demand vocational courses; agricultural communities want training in the field of their economic interests; each organized group or class in the community exerts its particular pressure on the schools. Then, too, general training of young people for intelligent participation in the life of their time has expanded in many directions. Preparation for college, training for citizenship, for culture, for character, for public health, for military service, and in the interest of wiping out illiteracy, educating adults, and even training in recreation have added enormously both to the range of subjects and the number of people directly touched by the schools. Programs have become overcrowded with courses competing for the interest of the student until both students and educators have become confused.

Since education to make a living, education for civic and social purposes, and moral and religious objectives have been interrelated and submerged in this confusion, thoughtful men for a number of years have been seeking a way out.

To help solve the rapidly accumulating problems and to keep up with the ever-extending specialization, associations are coming into existence with amazing rapidity. The Educational Directory for 1936 listed 49 educational organizations whose titles began with the word *American*

and 93 with the word *National*. In the publication for 1939 there are listed 153 *American* and 143 *National* and 33 *International*.[5] Grouped with these were 357 with less pretentious titles. Each of these 686 organizations represents some special aspect of education work. Add to these the organizations of states, counties, and municipalities and the array is impressive to say the least.

For a while there was almost a fatalistic belief in the power of education to regulate life and to make it efficient, harmonious, and complete. The results of education have rudely shaken these ideas. There are varied reasons for this.

There has come an increasing appreciation of the indefiniteness of aim. This weakness has been sensed for years. In its issue of March 11, 1923, the *New York Times* presented a symposium of exceedingly varied answers of distinguished educators who were asked to define the aims of the schools. In 1925 Leonard D. Koos presented *A Comparison of Aims from Elementary School to University*, which was the result of a study of 112 books and articles written by educators. He compiled a list of twenty-four different aims and functions which were mentioned not less than five times in these writings. It is an illuminating study. It reveals serious diversity of thought and aims and ends.[6] In commenting on the situation thus revealed Thomas Jesse Jones wrote: "The almost amazing multiplication of schools throughout the world is strangely accompanied by an increasing perplexity as to the methods and objectives of education. Even the daily press has taken notice of the doubts and anxieties and is accordingly sending out inquiries as to 'What the school is for.' "[7] He then adds: "The relating of social ideals and

---

[5]U. S. Department of the Interior, Office of Education, Bulletin 1939, No. 1, Part IV.

[6]*Educational Review*, April, 1925.

[7]Thomas Jesse Jones, *Four Essentials of Education* (Chas. Scribner's Sons, 1926), p. 1.

standards of character to the actual experience of life insures the reality of such abstractions. The ideals of democracy, social service, or religious faith in their abstract forms may be merely elusive and futile emotion. Founded upon a consciousness of community, they become directive and controlling convictions that impel action and guarantee the relation of these controlling concepts to each of the four elements of neighborhood. To what extent do the ideals of democracy, social service, and religion function for health, for an appreciation of the material and human environment, for wholesome home life, and for the re-creations of human society? Do these ideals vitalize governments, schools, churches, homes, labor, capital, art, and play? The answers to such inquiries, properly interpreted, should synthesize and humanize the diverse and almost innumerable activities of individuals and society into a living consciousness of community."[8]

The complex nature of present education policy and practice is further revealed as we scan the list of teachers' activities used in organizing the courses and curricula for graduate and undergraduate work of teachers' colleges. Formerly the "Commonwealth Teacher Training Study" by Charters and Waples was extensively used. Later the College of Education of the Ohio State University reorganized the list of courses commonly covered by the titles: educational psychology, principles of teaching, methods, student teaching, philosophy of education and history of education, with the statement: "In order to provide such a compact but comprehensive list, the original thousand and one activities of the Commonwealth List were regrouped under fifty-one larger activity topics." The announcement continued: "To complete the subsequent steps in the develop-

[8] *Ibid.*, pp. 25-26.

ment of the education courses, special techniques too detailed to be presented in this article were developed."[9]

Clarifying Educational Thinking

To bring order out of confusion, to clarify and intensify the thinking of educators and citizens on their common problems, and to bring larger unity and efficiency into public education the leading school organizations through various commissions have definitely formulated statements of their objectives, programs, and plans.

Careful examination of their reports is the more important as they are not merely an academic study by a small group of men. They are to be systematically propagated by thousands of consultants through the whole educational system as the official policy of our schools. The commissions are organized and definitely seek to carry the policies through to the citizenship of the entire country.

The men and women who are leaders in the American system of education are in fact charting systematically a comprehensive program for education in a democracy, including "character education" and the whole range of social ideals commonly associated with religion. It is important that religious leaders and especially parents, who certainly are even more interested in these plans for their children than are professional educators, inform themselves regarding this program. To a considerable extent it reduces to practical social terms much that religion has been preaching and urging in the abstract ideal. Such a program should call forth active support. Since it seems to take over functions and objectives which heretofore the home and the Church have regarded as largely their own, it is important to examine

[9]Educational Research Bulletin, College of Education, Ohio State University, May 16, 1934, pp. 114, 119.

this new and official statement of the position of the public schools. Does it make adequate provision for moral and spiritual values in education? Does it propose the development of character but without the aid of religion? What place is left for the church and for church schools in the new setup?

The significance of the newly formed policies for the public school, especially as they relate to character building, is so far-reaching that discussion in general is out of place. Effort is made here to present accurately and fairly, by quotation of their own words, what that position is.

The Educational Policies Commission, appointed by the National Education Association of the United States and the American Association of School Administration, is composed of thirteen educators with five ex-officio members, all of whom are considered experts in various fields of education, together with the Commissioner of Education of the United States government and his assistant. They have recently issued three volumes: the first of these, *The Unique Function of Education in American Democracy,* was printed in February, 1937; the second, *The Structure and Administration of Education in American Democracy,* in June, 1938; and the third, *The Purpose of Education in American Democracy,* in September, 1938. The purpose of the Policies Commission and its methods of approach are described as follows:

"When established two years ago, the Educational Policies Commission was charged not only with defining educational policies but also with securing the acceptance and utilization of those policies by educators. Beyond that the Commission has a residual responsibility to provide, through the profession, a measure of guidance for the educational thinking of the lay public.

"Twenty men and women, however, can reach directly only a small proportion of the profession. The 2,300 Consultants serve as arms of the Commission extending into every state and major community in the country; upon them rests an obligation to evaluate critically every pronouncement of policy and to encourage actively the use of those which are educationally acceptable.

"Consultants inform the Commission from time to time of the activities and methods which they employ for purposes of implementation. Certain of these appear to be so generally useful that they are here reported for the benefit of all.

"A simple device for spreading the influence of each Commission pronouncement is to form a voluntary committee of persons who read a document and enter into informal discussion with regard to issues presented."[10]

In a bulletin the Educational Policies Commission summarizes the publication, *The Purposes of Education in American Democracy,* and suggests possibilities for its immediate and widespread use. It names five processes of democracy which control the school program. (1) General Welfare, (2) Civil Liberty, (3) Consent of the Governed, (4) the Appeal to Reason, (5) the Pursuit of Happiness. After stressing self-realization as a guiding purpose of Democratic education, the report adds: "Our democracy, with its necessary and wholesome separation of Church and State, gives to every man and woman complete freedom of religious belief and opinion. We all have a right, a constitutionally-guaranteed right as well as a moral one, to choose that form of religious expression or outlook which we find most completely satisfying. The public schools are required by law and by every element of their tradition, scrupulously to re-

[10]Bulletin *Educational Policy,* Volume I, Number 2, December 15, 1937.

spect this American doctrine of religious liberty. The inculcation of any particular religious creed is therefore entirely foreign to the proper function of public education, although other educational agencies, particularly the home and the church, may well be actively concerned with such tuition. Yet there remain the great problems of human destiny which will always perplex, inspire, and ennoble the human spirit—problems of the relation of man to that which is beyond man, of the plan, if plan there be, which directs or conditions human existence on this planet, of the meaning in human birth, life, aspiration, suffering, and death. That man is not well educated who ignores these problems. Nor is he educated who maintains an attitude of cynical indifference or of intolerant bigotry toward the efforts of others to satisfy their spiritual needs. He is educated only when he understands and appreciates the spiritual and ethical principles which constitute a central part of the heritage of the race."[11]

In the volume on *Structure and Administration,* a chapter is devoted to the desirability of the complete separation of Church and State. To this idea the vast majority of the citizens of the Republic give their consent.

In the first chapter of the *Unique Function of Education,* education is asked to reconsider its position and its obligation to society. The book proposes five "guiding principles" upon which historically and socially the whole system seems to rest. The first two are: "1. Public education is anchored in the history of American civilization and at any moment operates within the accumulated heritage of that civilization." "2. Every system of thought and practice in education is formulated with some reference to the ideas and interests dominant or widely cherished in society at the time of its formulation."

---

[11] *Educational Policy,* published by the Educational Policies Commission, October 15, 1938.

Stating that the institutional expression sooner or later tends to conform to the system of thought so formulated, the *Unique Function* report portrays "the history of American civilization" and the "accumulated heritage" as the rise of democracy in the nation and the trend toward state control of its schools. The statement of the rise of democracy in terms of economic and social changes which have progressively broadened the field and responsibilities of the school will meet with general acceptance. Some exception might be taken to the historical basis developed for centralized control. In stating the "accumulated heritage of that civilization" in which public education is anchored, this Commission report makes no reference to religion or the Church except as "sectarianism" from which the schools have been progressively attaining their freedom. Such a presentation of historical background purporting to be authoritative and comprehensive can hardly go unchallenged.

The second guiding principle quoted above is equally valid as a basis for the educational system, but in developing "interests dominant or widely cherished in society" the report again omits religion, although it gives an excellent statement of changing economic and social forces and even of moral interests. Obligations are frankly faced. "Knowledge alone is not enough—ethics is indispensable" (page 80); "education includes the training of body and spirit" (page 83); "education fosters the social virtues by example" (page 84); "education supplies an ethical cement that helps to hold together the very civilization in which all services operate" (page 101). "Forever affiliated with education in varying degrees of intensity is the inscrutable urge of aspiration and creative intelligence which gives elevation to daily duties and seeks the improvement of the heritage. It guards those virtues of the race that are vouchsafed to the humblest —industry, patience, self-denial, and consideration for

others" (page 71). In short, the Commission report on *The Unique Function of Education in American Democracy* seems to find the historical basis in social and economic changes and an escape from "sectarian" control which have greatly expanded the responsibility of the public school system, even including the field of morals. By implication, religion is virtually excluded or ignored.

A later report from another source is now available and deserves careful study. It is the *Regents' Inquiry into the Character and Cost of Public Education in the State of New York.* This report was published in November, 1938, in a book of 168 pages entitled *Education for American Life.* The Committee on the Inquiry was composed of eleven men and one woman, who assembled a staff of expert educators and investigators who apparently did a careful piece of work. The first statement in the *Foreword* is: "Education must always be a matter of central importance to the American people. This has been recognized from our earliest days. New York State's Commission on Common Schools of 1812, which laid the foundation of the State's public school system, began its report with the statement:

" 'If education be the cause of the advancement of other nations, it must be apparent to the most superficial observer of our peculiar political constitutions, that it is essential, not to our prosperity only, but to the very existence of our government . . . In a government like ours, where the people is the sovereign power; where the will of the people is the law of the land, which will is openly and directly expressed and where every act of the government may justly be called the act of the people, it is absolutely essential that the people be enlightened.' "[12]

In the report under the subtitle *New Factors Today* they declare their belief that the changes in ways of living which

[12] *Education for American Life* (The McGraw Hill Co.), p. IX.

seem most significant "have come in family life, in the influence of the church and other ethical institutions, in the disappearance of work as part of the child's early training, in the increased need of skill in co-operative living, in the growth of new kinds of propaganda and the ceaseless and heightened demand upon the individual's emotions and attention, and in the increase of leisure time in adult years." They explain the causes of decline in the home and then add:

"It is more difficult to explain what has happened to change the influence of the church, because few people know or will look at the facts honestly. In the course of this Inquiry, from talking with hundreds of youth and with their teachers, and examining the problem of delinquency in its relation to religious education, we find that youth today are not receiving from the church or from the family the ethical and spiritual foundations which youth need and want. Other agencies, vigorously supported by the churches in most instances, are beginning to fill the gap in part, but they have not been recognized as essential to education, as was the church in the days of our fathers."[13]

The *Research Bulletin* of the National Education Association of March, 1934, is on "Education for Character." On page 47 is the statement: "A major task of education is to correct the mistaken idea that basic ethical principles are no longer useful. Education must aid the individual in rediscovering and accepting these principles. It must guide him in applying them wisely to new and changing problems. Above all, it must inspire him to utilize these principles in directing social change itself for the greater welfare of society." Following a long discussion based on surveys from page 47 to page 74, after declaring that "negative results

---

[13]*Education for American Life* (The McGraw Hill Co.), p. 33.

reported here should not be interpreted as an unfavorable criticism of all types of religious education," the declaration is made:

"The proper relation between the church and the public school in character education is a problem which, within certain limits, must be solved separately by each local community. The school can undoubtedly help to make religious organizations more effective by maintaining a fundamentally religious outlook in its own work. Members of the school staff may also be encouraged to participate in worthy church activities, including church programs of religious education. It should be pointed out also that in some communities the churches are given a certain amount of school time each week for instructing the pupils in religious and moral principles."

A series of helpful leaflets are now being prepared by the editors of *The Journal of the National Education Association* who state, "The preparation of the *Personal Growth Messages* was prompted by the conviction that the greatest need of humanity today is strength, integrity, happiness, and excellence in the individual life—in millions of individual lives."[14] Apparently these leaflets are designed to do what the Bible and religious literature formerly did.

While the reports cited above are most recent, much light is thrown on the attitude toward education for character of those responsible for our school system, and the place in it assigned to the Church, by the following quotations of an earlier date. They show a trend in thinking over a period of years.

Possibly the most pronounced stand on matters pertaining to ethical and religious questions taken by the National Education Association up to that time was contained in a resolution adopted at the 1907 meeting:

---

[14] *The Journal of the National Education Association*, October, 1938, p. A-129.

"Resolved, that it is the sense of this Association that it is the duty of the teachers of this Republic to at once enter upon a systematic course of instruction which shall embrace not only a broader patriotism, but a more extended course of moral instruction, especially in regard to the rights and duties of citizenship, the right of property, the security and sacredness of human life."

The Department of Higher Education, after considering the problem of religious education in state universities, adopted the following: "Resolved, that the Department of Higher Education, recognizing the rapid growth of the State Universities in numbers and the importance of social and religious work for students, most cordially approves the movements now being promoted in order to make adequate provision for the social and religious needs of students, and expresses the hope that the several Churches will co-operate in meeting this need."

Later the Commission on Curriculum for Secondary Schools of the National Education Association defined the general objectives of all education as follows: "To promote the development of an understanding and an adequate evaluation of (1) the self, (2) of the world of nature, (3) of organized society, and (4) of an appreciation of the force of law and of love that is operating universally. The individual self, nature, society, and God—these four, and in particular the adjustments which the individual self must make—constitute the objectives of education. A full understanding of the magnitude of the task reveals the need of continuing education throughout the whole period of life. Our specific undertaking at this time is to show the part which secondary education may take in helping youth on its way from lower to higher levels of attainment."[15]

---

[15] *Religion, The Dynamic of Education*, Edited by Walter M. Howlett (Harper & Brothers, 1929), pp. 4, 5.

In a fine way the Commission further commented on the fourth objective: "Man craves more than a knowledge of himself, of nature and of organized society. He hungers and he thirsts after righteousness. Knowing his own imperfections, he feels that somewhere there is perfection. The great universe calls to his spirit and unless he ignorantly or willfully closes his ears, he hears the voice of God."

After careful study, by prominent educators, over a period of several months, a Committee of the National Association announced these as "Desirable Social-Economic Goals for America": (1) Hereditary strength; (2) Physical security; (3) Participation in an evolving culture, such as (a) skills, technics, and knowledge, (b) values, standards and outlooks; (4) An active, flexible personality, revealed in (a) personal initiative, (b) discriminating judgment and choice, (c) flexibility of thought and conduct, (d) individual differences and (e) co-operativeness; (5) Suitable occupation, involving (a) guidance, (b) training, (c) placement and advancement; (6) Economic security; (7) Mental security; (8) Equality of opportunity; (9) Freedom; and (10) Fair play.

The Tenth Year Book of the Department of Superintendence of the National Education Association, February, 1932, under the title, "Character Education," presents a list of the agencies of Character Education as follows: 1. The Family, 2. The Community, 3. Industry, 4. The Church, 5. The institution of private property, 6. The press, 7. The cinema, 8. The radio, 9. Modern transportation, 10. Other agencies. It will be noted that the Church has been assigned the fourth place, and this information is added:

"The position of the church today is one of confusion and uncertainty. It has lost much of the authority with which it at one time was clothed. If it faces the problems of the age, it must speak with a faltering voice. Only when it

employs the outworn dogmas of the past and appeals to certain of the traditional prejudices of the people does it appear to have confidence in its own pronouncements. But in that event it reaches an ever-contracting circle of adherents" (page 23).

Is the Suggested Program Complete?

Examination of the reports of the commissions and of the earlier pronouncements of responsible organizations controlling the public school system referred to above, as well as many other of their publications, enables one to evaluate their position from the standpoint of the Church.

First of all, one must note with appreciation and satisfaction the fine spirit in which the question has been examined. The men and women who have formulated these documents have given patient and careful study to some complicated and involved problems which press hard for solution. The scope and purpose of education in a democracy is more fully defined and clearly stated than ever before. They reveal a clear sense of appreciation of the urgency of the task before democracy. Their call to action should awaken many out of a sleep of complacency. Their presentations are usually calm and dispassionate. They are to be cordially commended for this. Harsh judgments, angry words, biting criticisms are out of place when questions of such momentous importance are under consideration.

The part of the public school program as outlined in their publications which touches the immediate interests of the Church may be summarized in three propositions:

1. The public school educators and administrators recognize that education for democracy is neither complete nor at a satisfactory level until it includes character training and an effort to achieve spiritual values.

2. They show a declining confidence that the home or the Church, under modern conditions, is able to provide such training within the limitations imposed by law.

3. They assert an increasing, if not complete, responsibility for all education—including the moral—centering in the public schools, relegating the home and the Church to minor roles.

With the first of these positions the Church is in complete accord. It is encouraged to note a growing recognition on the part of those most responsible for public education of the deeper and more important values. This fact justifies the Church in turning over to secular control and support the great bulk of educational responsibility which it formerly held. The Church shares the concern of the public school educators for the quality of teaching, the influences which surround the schools, the development of well-rounded personality, as well as the intellectual instruction and training of the boys and girls.

The third proposition is the most radical, is open to question, and should have more careful consideration by the home and the Church and the school. This reveals an assumption by the school of virtually complete responsibility for character education. History of the past as well as present-day experience leads one to believe that they are assuming for the schools of democracy a load that could easily crush the spirit of the most heroic—including in addition to vocational training, cultural, moral, ethical, and also spiritual development which has heretofore been associated with religion. They are proposing to achieve greater unity and solidarity of the entire public education system, under expert guidance, if not control.

While gratefully welcoming all possible help in developing the whole life of boys and girls, the Church may well be skeptical of the ability of secular education to provide

effective character training divorced from religion. In a previous chapter we have seen how the founders of our democracy recognized the necessity of the religious element in education and how the dangers of a purely secular education were recognized. Illustrations that validate their concern abound.

Dr. M. H. Buckham, while President of the University of Vermont, in the annual address as President of the Association of American Agricultural Colleges and Experiment Stations, speaking of the religious teaching and training of students in state schools at that time, said: "When we seek to do anything for their religious nurture, we find ourselves amid such perplexities that we are practically doing little or nothing, and are vainly trying to quiet our consciences in a situation which we know to be logical and which we hope will sometime be solved by a wisdom better than ours. Meanwhile we see our institutions sending out a type of educated men well represented in Gallio in the Acts of the Apostles, 'He cared for none of those things,'—not atheistic, not actually hostile to religion, certainly not religious—negative and indifferent toward the whole subject, lacking in those qualities of charity and sweet reasonableness which nothing but religion can produce, often reappearing as teachers in the colleges to reproduce in their pupils a new generation of the same type as themselves. I fear that it might truthfully be said that, while we clear ourselves of the charge of teaching dogmatics and denominationalism, we are laying ourselves open to the charge of teaching that manhood and womanhood may be complete without the religious element of character."

Pressed to its logical conclusion this third proposition forces us back to the philosophy of the Greeks and their efforts to develop the moral life. Paul Monroe gives a brief summary of how the Greeks "who first strove to live by reason" had to arrive at a conception of personality which

is morally responsible and morally free, where each individual had to find "in his rational nature the sanction for determining his own ends in life, and in his moral nature the conception of these ends as shaped by his own being"—each working out for himself "the things that life is to be lived for. Since the aim of education, as limited in the work of the American schools today, must eliminate the religious element, it can find no higher purpose than that of determining for each individual the things in this life that are best worth living for. Consequently, no other phase of educational history has more significance for the student, or will better repay consideration of the means and methods adopted for securing this end."[16]

They show a surprising attitude toward the home and the Church. Neither of these groups is functioning in just the same way as formerly. Both need fuller and more intelligent support from high and low, rich and poor, capital and labor, professional men and women, and educational authorities. Neither is what it ought to be, but each is doing a work which cannot be done by any other group. Recent tests have shown that the influences of the home in the things of the spirit are far more powerful and enduring than those of the school. The reader of this statement can check its validity in his own experience.

The Church is not moribund. It still has abundant life and its influence is far greater than those on the outside think. There are in the United States 245,005 churches and synagogues and 58.5 per cent of the population of 13 years of age and over are members of one of the religious bodies—besides millions of adherents. Each church, like every thinking man, has a creed—that word comes from the Latin *credo,* I believe. This belief is often called *dogma,* which

---

[16]Paul Monroe, *A Brief Course in the History of Education* (The Macmillan Co., 1911), p. 30. Used by permission.

means "that which is held as an opinion." A bad use of this word is made to reflect on the Church; men are scornfully called "dogmatic." It must be regretfully admitted by the churches that a few are just that. They are offensively opinionated, puffed up, dictatorial, afraid for the truth, forgetting the words of the Bible "fail or succeed, I cannot work against the truth but for it!"[17] Educators should pay no more attention to such men than Church men and women do to educators who reveal a similar spirit and attitude.

The Church is divided, and yet of the 212 denominations and divisions in America, one half have less than 7,000 adherents each and 91 per cent of the members belong to twenty-one bodies. Educators do not all think alike, and their organizations are numerous and diverse. On the great fundamental truths there is wonderful agreement among the churches. The father of Professor Henry Drummond was a very strict churchman, who reared his family in ignorance of the works of other churches. George Adam Smith said: "Henry once naively told me that this experience was the source to him afterwards of the most delightful surprises at the great amount of good in the world." "The word *sect* is a good word—meaning a section of a body. But it is quite offensive to refer to the church, which has led the world into an appreciation of the worth of the individual man and of the spiritual values and forces of life and developed the springs of philanthropy and service, as a 'sectarian' body."

Any reference to public education in America which failed to note the high character and essential service of many of the teachers in our schools would be woefully insufficient. Many of these are rendering a difficult, unselfish, untiring, efficient service that has not been excelled in any land in any age of the world. It is to the shame of political leaders that

---

[17]II Corinthians 13:8. (From *The Bible:* A New Translation, by James Moffatt, Harper & Brothers, publishers.)

they have not been provided a more stable and adequate financial remuneration and to the citizens of our nation that they have been so slow in recognizing the invaluable contribution the teacher makes to the democracy. No officer or employee of the legislative, administrative, or judicial branches of the government renders higher or more needed service than the teachers—often forgotten and allowed to pass on "unhonor'd and unsung."

It is a matter of regret that these capable educators who are shaping policies of public education have not sought more definitely the fuller co-operation of the home and the Church. "Organized education" cannot take the place of religion. Democracy cannot be made safe unless the people discern what is good and learn that God requires of man "to do justly, and to love kindness, and to walk humbly with thy God."[18] The social order cannot successfully be "organized apart from God." This is not a call for the Church to seek control of public education. The public schools are here, they have a place in democracy that is necessary and of highest value. They have the support of the Church. It is an earnest, heartfelt plea that all think and study and plan and work together. Possibly there is need for a "Church Policies Commission" to state more clearly and pungently and authoritatively what I have tried to express, and to hasten more complete understanding and more helpful co-operation in our common task.

---

[18]Micah 6:8. (A. S. V.)

CHAPTER V

THE PRESENT OPPORTUNITY OF THE CHURCH

THE public schools and the high schools literally cover the land. Almost every child today can remain under the parental roof and attend one of these institutions. The discipline which must have an important function in the early life of children in the home is carried over into the school and the high school. Some formal and regimented discipline must be continued. This affords a fine possible co-operation between home and school. Where children are properly developed by both precept and example of parents in the home, the schools can reinforce the truths imparted to mind and heart by the work and habits of the schools. The new plans of the Policies Commission will intensify and enlarge this service. The Church and the home may implant ideals and the school may help bring these ideals into the practice of the daily life. Knowledge and conduct must be connected in life. At this period of life there is needed the closest and most sympathetic co-operation between home and Church and school.

The Opportunity in the Pulpit

Possibly never before were the responsibility and opportunity of the pulpit greater than today. No longer is the minister the *parson* (*the* person) of the community. Where in the past he was often the only thoroughly educated and trained man, there are now hundreds of individuals trained for special service. Instead of this being a loss it should be turned into a real gain. He now can give more time and energy to his supreme task. He can inspire and inform and

enlist the enlightened hosts in the supreme undertaking of the ages. He can guide and strengthen the homes and the church school. He can help unify and make more effective the relations of the church with the public school and the other social agencies and forces of the community. He can devote his abilities to the stirring message of the seer, the prophet, the teacher. While others are busy and restless and distraught he can constantly remind them of what they are so constantly forgetting, that the abiding interests of life have to do not alone with causes and effects, but with purposes and means and ends. He can call back—to a fuller comprehension of the unity of life, the imperativeness of duty, the power of love, the glory of sacrifice and service, and the plan and presence and power of the living God—a generation which has become confused with its own knowledge and bewildered by its own disintegrations.

Dr. W. H. P. Faunce in 1908 wrote a message which every minister should read. He wisely called his book *The Educational Ideal in the Ministry,* and not the teaching function of the ministry. He took great pains to show that the pulpit should not become merely an echo of the professor's chair and thus robbed of its power. While the knowledge of facts is important in religious education, he declares "the supremely important elements are ideals, standards, values."

In the maze of information—true and false—that comes to youth as well as age today, over radio, in forums, conferences, addresses, books, magazines, and papers, the great need is for light to make clear moral and spiritual values and to reconcile and bring into unity the varied and conflicting theories of our complex and restless civilization. There is great and awful need for this. Ideas and the influence and power of religion are being crowded out by other interests. Vocational and commercial and economic interests dominate

many minds. Truly has George A. Coe said: "To receive no religious impression at all is exactly equivalent to receiving the impression that religion is unimportant in spiritual development."

Astonishing reports were made by chaplains and others who engaged in religious work among the American and the British soldiers in the World War. It was discovered that many of these men knew little about spiritual forces and purposes, and were largely ignorant of the faiths by which Christian men and women live and the ideals of life which they hold. Blame was laid at the door of the home, the churches, the ministers, the Sunday schools, and the public schools.

Did the report of the Commissions appointed to study these problems arouse the church and the school to action? Certainly not to the extent expected. In the *Atlantic Monthly* for October, 1938, appeared an article by Dr. Bernard Iddings Bell, "More Dogma, Please." He tells of the hopeless task he undertook, to teach a freshman class at a university intended to help the students correlate religion with the new truths to which they were being introduced day by day in science and philosophy. The course of study was rendered ridiculous, "because the young men—almost all of them the products of Christian Sunday schools, many of them church members and used to receiving pulpit admonitions—had no religion that was sufficiently choate to be related to anything at all." Dr. Bell recounts some of the frivilous and absurd notions many held about religion and adds: "This was the sort of thing I was supposed to be connecting up, or helping them to connect up, in a synthesis with science and philosophy. On the one hand were precise, definite science and logical thought-provoking philosophy; on the other, only a vague emotionality, or, it may be, the half-forgotten memory of a former emotionality." He then

took "those charming but spiritually illiterate undergraduates and put them through a brief but competent course in fundamental theology. They were intensely interested in it." More recent reports recount the same sad lack. On February 5, 1939, the daily papers carried the message of the General Secretary of the International Council of Religious Education to the annual convention in Chicago in which he called attention to "the 20,000,000 youth of our democracy who are sometimes called spiritually illiterate."

A mother recently wrote: "The home can inculcate Christian virtues upon the children, familiarize them with the Bible by daily readings, train them in habits of churchgoing, reverence and morals, but in how many homes in our land could the father or mother, even if they saw the need, teach their children the nature of faith, the real purpose of life, *why* we believe in God, accept the Bible as a divine revelation, take the Ten Commandments as a rule of conduct? The great fundamental doctrines should be presented by the *minister,* who is the appointed teacher and who has studied these very things in order that he might preach them to his people. This is no call for a formal doctrinal sermon, from which everybody flees, but for sermons on life and living so saturated with these vital truths that young and old will unconsciously imbibe them and assimilate them into their very souls. In this the minister may see that the boys and girls who have sat under his preaching shall know whereof they have believed and be able to give a reason for the hope that is in them, when challenged by those who are careless or indifferent to spiritual things."

The message needed today is not one concerning solely "the spirit of the age," but the Spirit of all the ages. There are great eternal truths which like their Author are the same yesterday, today, and forever. The belief in the orderliness of the physical world is the basis of the physical sciences.

The recognition of the moral order of the universe is the foundation of the moral and spiritual life. On one of the walls of the Government Building at the Texas Centennial Fair were these words: "The principles of virtue and justice are unchangeable and indestructible and the government which shall be reared on the one and administered on the other cannot fail to be an eternal bulwark to the rights of man."

The Christian message is centered on the unseen and the eternal—clearly connecting these facts and forces with life and with living. How marvelously did the Master Teacher accomplish this! How hard it is to follow His method! "Things are in the saddle and ride mankind." Too often do men fail to pray, "Forgive me for the sin and the folly of a hurried life"—forgetting the injunction, "Be still and know that I am God." Too seldom do they pray, "Take the dimness of my soul away."

Spiritual things must be made real and personal. Faith must become the faculty by which man takes a thing on trust in order that he may discover whether it is true. When Thomas R. Huxley wrote: "Theology says the just shall live by faith; science says the just shall live by verification," he was confused about the meaning of the great New Testament word *faith*. The Christian, like the scientist, must have faith. Both have a right and an obligation to verify that faith. No one should be merely credulous —accepting a thing on trust without any effort to find out whether it is true or false. The Christian message is, "Come and see";[1] "prove all things; hold fast that which is good."[2]

Dr. Thomas Chalmers, the Scotch minister, writer, and social welfare pioneer said: "The historical evidences of Christianity are abundantly sufficient to satisfy the scrutiny

---

[1]John 1:39.
[2]I Thessalonians 5:21.

of the learned, and they are within the reach of all well educated persons. But the internal evidences of the truth have a still wider influence, for they are open and intelligible to every sincere inquirer. Every man who reads the Bible with attention, and observes the value and excellence of the book—every man who compares what it says of mankind with his own experience, and marks the fitness of its mighty scheme of doctrine to his own spiritual need as a sinner in the sight of God—is furnished with practical proof of the divine origin of our religion. I love this evidence; I call it the portable evidence of Christianity."[3]

The minister must constantly remind the people that for the formation of moral character the home, supplemented by the church, is the place of primacy and power. The whole worship of the church should be so planned and conducted that the entire family may be inspired and edified. Almost all organizations tend to separate the family. The father finds his place there, the mother here; the boys go one way, the girls another. Nothing does more for the spiritual development of the young than close association with older people who are living the Christian life. The hour of worship in the house of God still offers one of the most powerful unifying forces in modern life. If the habit of churchgoing is not developed early in life, when will it be formed? Worship is learned in worshiping assemblies. Songs and reverent prayers make their impression on the heart at the tenderest age. What answer must be given to the question of William G. Ballantine, "Can a generation engrossed in money-making during the week and in merry-making at the week-ends give time enough to the children to pass on to them the habits of the Christian life?" The ties which bind home and church and parents and children should be so natural

---

[3]Related by Joseph John Gurney in *Hints on the Portable Evidence of Christianity* (Samuel Wood & Sons, 1834), p. V.

and strong that they will not be broken when the child leaves home or transfers from high school to college. The destinies of life to a large degree are bound up with the group of which individuals are members. No man liveth to himself alone—and the most powerful groups are the home and the church.

The instruction both in the home and in the church by both precept and example, must be given in a spirit of love, mutual understanding, and sincerity. Paul in his great hymn of love makes this clear: "Though I speak with the tongues of men and of angels, and have not love, I am become as sounding brass or a tinkling cymbal. And though I have the gift of prophecy, and understand all mysteries and all knowledge; and though I have all faith, so that I could remove mountains, and have not love, I am nothing."[4] Much teaching and much preaching fail because technical or unusual words obscure the truth. "In the church," said Paul, "I had rather speak five words with my understanding, that by my voice I might teach others also, than ten thousand words in an unknown tongue."[5]

Both the message from the pulpit and the instruction of the Sunday school, the weekday Bible school, the daily vacation Bible school and the programs of the young people's organizations, and the efforts of the student pastors at our own colleges and the state institutions of higher education, may find a more fertile soil and richer fruits because of the nationwide plans to bring larger unity and efficiency into our public education. Certainly all should seek more helpful co-operation between Church and school. The great doctrines taught by the Church must be worked out in the daily life. The high ideals held before the mind must go down into the heart and the will, and word must be trans-

[4] I Corinthians 13:1-3.
[5] I Corinthians 14:19.

lated into deed. The school must seek to develop *habits* that will fit men and women for life in a democracy. The Church seeks to give light and direction and dynamic needed for this task.

The Opportunity in the Home

There must be some discipline for a well-ordered life. America was called by Leon Paul Blonet (Max O'Rell) "a nation of obedient parents." Each child should acquire the habit of acting in obedience to parents first and then to the voice of an enlightened conscience. If respect for law and authority is not acquired in the home, the boy or girl will likely have little respect for the law of God or of the land. This does not accord with the theories which some educators, who dwell too much on surface facts, advocate; but filial confidence and love are at the basis of character. Parents are under a sacred obligation to reveal in their dealings with their children justice and love, truth and sympathetic understanding. The school can back up this home discipline and together they can impart a spirit and an attitude that will give more hope of steady steering through the dangers that beset life.

The French philosopher Paul Janet spoke wisely when he said in 1864: "I must insist upon the principle of authority and of constraint, for, however disagreeable it may be to our thinking, it is of great importance. Without it dissolution and anarchy make their way into the family. A spirit of premature freedom withdraws the child from the authority of its parents. Youth pretends to the independence of maturity, and childhood lays claim to the prerogatives of youth, so that we have young gentlemen of twelve and old fellows of twenty-five. Not that I would belittle the dignity of childhood and youth, or delay the moment of their emancipation. It is exactly for the protection of both

that I plead. These 'liberal' views of the training of the young break down just at the point where they propose to treat the child as a man already formed. And then the practice always outruns the theory; it is so pleasant, and so well suits our own weakness, to come upon a doctrine which justifies us to ourselves and to our neighbors. Hence this 'let alone' theory of child-training, which is a note of our times [in France in 1864!], and which gives the admirers of the past their opportunity to groan over the decay of family character.

"Nor is it only the family that suffers through the abandonment of parental authority. Social discipline is corrupted at its very fountain-head. That reverence for authority which is fundamental to all society can be taught only at home; and he finds nothing in life sacred who has not learned the sanctities of the household life. The child brought up in a disorderly and lawless home can be no element of orderliness and loyalty in the state. This is the significance of the commandment, which commands towards father and mother no mere outward obedience, but the honor the heart only can render, and which makes the permanence of society dependent upon the diffusion of this habit through the members of the nation."

The church must reach back into the home to arouse parents to a new sense of their responsibility. Fathers especially should awake. "In the earlier years," said Charles E. Jefferson, "children can be controlled by their mother; but by and by there comes a time when they begin to note the conduct of the father. No eyes are keener than the eyes of a child. He sees everything the father does; he reflects on what the father does not do. His logic is inexorable. He argues his way to conclusions which cannot be shaken. If his father does not pray, prayer must be unnecessary. Grown men surely know what is needed. If his father never reads

the Bible, then the Big Book can be dispensed with. Fathers know what books are most worth reading. If he does not go to church, then church attendance is a pastime and not a duty, for men so old and wise as father is would not neglect church, if church were of value to them. If he never talks of God, or Christ, or the Holy Spirit, if he shows no interest in the Bible, or church work, the inference is clear and certain that religion is not a vital part of human life. A man in his home may feel secure from the cold-eyed scrutiny of the world, but if he have children, he is subjected to a gaze almost as piercing as the eyes of God. Is there anything which escapes the eyes of a child? Who is quicker to note inconsistencies, and to detect hypocrisies? A man's piety is no better than that which he displays at home. In every home the judgment seat is set, and he who sits upon it is a little child. A failure to measure up to one's professions is always humiliating, but it becomes altogether galling in the presence of children who look up to us and trust us."[6]

Grover Cleveland, former President of the United States, wrote an article for the *Saturday Evening Post* on the question, "Does a College Education Pay?" There is one paragraph of perennial freshness and of continuing value. It should be read and its suggestions adopted by fathers who turn over to others the moral and spiritual development of their children and who plan their later education.

"Parents should never send their sons to college simply for the purpose of educational ornamentation. The fact that parents have the fate of a son largely in their keeping should not only enlist their parental love and pride, but should, at the same time, stimulate their parental judgment. Furthermore, they should be constantly mindful that they have in charge not only a son, but an uncompleted man, who is

---

[6]Charles E. Jefferson, *Quiet Talks with the Family* (Thomas Y. Crowell Company, 1916).

soon to become their contribution to the manhood of the world. They therefore owe a dual duty, which demands on the one hand that the education of the son be undertaken as a help to his success in life, and on the other that this education shall promise for the maturing man the equipment necessary to insure his value as an addition to civilized humanity. Before he leaves home to enter upon his student life his sympathy with these purposes should be fully aroused, and he should be impressed with the importance of keeping them steadily in view. He should also take with him to his new surroundings a love of truth and honor, a cheerful, manly disposition, and truly democratic inclinations. With these his collegiate advent must be auspicious, and his future life well guarded against failure. Lacking these, his way is made immensely more difficult and uncertain."

The Opportunity in the College

After high school as the boy or girl leaves home external discipline must be of a different character and the controls of life must be further developed within. A most critical period of life is reached as the boy or girl goes from home to college or university. To which should they go? It may help one to answer this question to mark clearly the functions of the institutions of higher education. What is the place and function of the college in the setup of institutions, and how does it differ from the other institutions in the school system?

The Christian college makes its appeal to the worthy man and woman. The unworthy neither care for its spirit nor concur in its purpose; they do not fit into its processes nor share its ideals. These are spiritual and are spiritually discerned. "The college," said Bishop William F. McDowell, "gets to be a Christian college in consequence of its atmosphere, its tone, its ideals; it exalts learning and enthrones

Jesus Christ. It sets before itself as an ideal the highest culture, the truest relationships, and a personal knowledge of Jesus Christ. It believes in character and culture, godliness and knowledge, piety, morality and learning."

"For the conduct and character of its students," wrote President William DeWitt Hyde, "a college assumes a far more intimate responsibility than a university. Toward vice in its three dread forms, drunkenness, gambling and licentiousness, it will exercise a severity unknown to universities in this or any other land." And there is need for wise, sympathetic, but firm and intelligent contacts with youth who are just going out of the home into a world that is new and strange.

The chief dangers that face the student are not in the teaching of error in the classroom, nor in the power of unprincipled individuals and groups to lead the weak and thoughtless astray. The new student becomes bewildered. Everything is new and strange. In the home many of his standards were external, imposed from without; the ideals, purposes, and opinions were derived largely from father and mother. A change must come. What will it be? What standards will now determine his course, what choices will now be made, what rational basis will now be accepted for plan and work, for faith and life?

The college, which has never wholly relinquished its function, *in loco parentis,* puts forth a supreme effort to develop the inner springs of action, to lead the students to a full realization of the promise of God, "I will put my laws into their minds, and write them in their hearts; and I will be to them a God, and they shall be to me a people."[7] Every effort is put forth to develop a moral conscience so the student may know what to do and why he should do it. It is a delicate, difficult, supremely important period of life when

[7]Hebrews 8:10; 10:16; Jeremiah 31:33.

the man must put away childish things and learn to speak and understand and think as a man. Help both human and divine is needed.

It is far better if at all possible to have the more quiet, spiritual, purposeful atmosphere of the small college at this period than the noise of the machines and confusion of the throngs which pour into the large universities. The colleges of the Church have retained a sympathetic concern for the moral life of their students. They have not accepted the theory of nonresponsibility along this line.

The one point of contact between Church and school that offers the supreme opportunity to reinforce education in the democracy at its weakest point is the college. It offers a suitable place to which the boy and girl may go as they leave the parental roof; its distinctive aim is to develop character, to impart culture, to build up men and women into well-rounded personalities, who know how to think, who cherish high ideals and who will act with unselfish consideration for others as they serve their own generation in the home, the school, the state, the democracy, and the world.

In the thinking of many people the college has a vague and indefinite place in our system of education. America has developed three types of institutions in the field of education: the high school, the college, and the university. Of these, the liberal arts college is the most distinctive contribution to education.

The college is not a little university. "Most universities," writes President Walter Dill Scott, of Northwestern University, "are alike in that they promote intellectual development as a means for carrying out three closely related but different functions: First, the enrichment of the life of the individual student by a study of carefully selected cultural and intellectual subjects. Second, the training of individual students for social service by preparation for one of the pro-

fessions. Third, the increase of human knowledge by a mastery of some field of human learning and by independent research therein.

"In a university undergraduate college the chief emphasis is on the enrichment of the life of the individual student. In a university professional school the chief emphasis is on the training of students for social service. In a university graduate school the major emphasis is on the increase of human knowledge.

"In other words, the undergraduate college develops *men,* the professional school develops *specialists,* and the graduate school develops productive *scholars.*"

It is important to clear thinking, also, to compare the college and the junior college. A very real danger exists of the traditional four-year college of liberal arts being "squeezed out" of the educational system between the professional school above and the high school expanded into a junior college below. The theory of the public junior college is to save time and money in preparation for vocations and professions by combining the freshman and sophomore years of college with high school training, the student then going directly from this general education into his specialty at an earlier age. Eventually this would mean a six-year grade school, a four-year unit combining two years of the grades and two of high school, and a third unit combining the last two of high school. Some students cannot afford a full college course, although for those who are intellectually equipped a large number of scholarships are available to reduce the expense. Some for family reasons must attend college at home, or are forced to hurry their preparation for an income-producing vocation. For all these the junior college is the best substitute.

Colleges of the type fostered by the Church conform to the first of these functions described by President Scott. They

seek to develop *men* by the enrichment of the life of the individual student. Increasing human knowledge by exhaustive research, or training experts in scores of professional or vocational lines, is not the business of the college. The one reason that the college lies closer to the Church in education is that it develops men rather than research scholars or experts. A vague feeling persists that because the university is bigger than the college and includes all these professional and vocational courses and research laboratories it must provide better education. Rather, universities often become a battleground of competing and conflicting objectives, each seeking to emphasize its own purposes at the expense of the other, resulting in a confusion of educational thinking.

In the judgment of President Hutchins, of the University of Chicago, the university is like an encyclopedia whose only unity is in its alphabetical arrangement; a service station by the wayside of life, sensitive to the transient whims and needs of the public whom it seeks to serve. He pictures it as mastered by the standards of empirical and historical sciences, producing a state of intellectual atomism and general cultural anarchy.

Many become confused because they fail to distinguish the difference between the college and the university. Both are desirable and necessary in a democracy, but they differ greatly in size, purpose, and scope. Many people are misled by the difference in size. Others criticize the college for not doing what it never was intended to do.

The college has had, and retains today, a very definite and distinct comprehension of its scope and of its work. It is working towards clear and well-defined ends. Its success has not been perfect, its life is not always as planned, but it can face the present and the future on the basis of its fruits.

No better statement was ever made of what the college does to enrich the personality of the student than that of

William DeWitt Hyde, of Bowdoin: "To be at home in all lands and all ages; to count nature a familiar acquaintance, and art an intimate friend; to gain a standard for the appreciation of other men's work and the criticism of your own; to carry the key of the world's library in your pocket, and feel its resources behind you in whatever task you undertake; to make hosts of friends among the men of your own age who are to be leaders in all walks of life; to lose yourself in generous enthusiasms and co-operate with others for common ends; to learn manners from students who are gentlemen, and form character under professors who are Christians —this is the offer of the college for the best four years of your life."

This was true when Dr. Hyde said it. Its truth is even more evident today when the broad culture of the whole man is needed to offset the narrow specialization to which men have been forced in the fields of labor and of education. Cultural education opens a door of better understanding of other men and their interests and problems, and lends interest and sympathy so greatly needed in the world at all times. It imparts a better understanding of other peoples, of other lands, of other times. The classics, it has been said, "are contemporary in any age; that is why they are called classics." The colleges make full use of the Bible, the great classic, which deals truly with life and with living and offers the greatest treasures for the enrichment of the spirit. By this cultural education men are prepared to live and to live together in understanding harmony and helpfulness.

Culture is not a finished product cut off in time and space. It is rooted in the past and each life has been largely shaped by events and persons that have gone before. There is a vital connection between the past, the present, and the future, and man needs a clear apprehension of old truths and errors which have been demonstrated as true or false by the

experience of the past. But the debt he owes to the past cannot divert his attention from his responsibility to the present and his obligation to the future. The college education is, therefore, directed largely to the future and its center is the living student rather than the dead subject matter. Students are of more value than the curricula. Therefore, many colleges are centering their efforts more on supplying the student with tools with which he may help to do the world's work than on exclusively loading him with knowledge. Most important of these tools is the mind trained to think straight and clear.

Of this tool President Henry M. Wriston, of Brown University, recently wrote: "Machinery has replaced hands. Manual skills that once guaranteed a good living are now valueless. But no machine ever replaced an alert mind. Machines can only do things done before, and in the same way. The mind may solve problems never before solved; therefore, in getting ready for life emphasize mental skills and personal effectiveness." It is becoming increasingly urgent that this fact be fully understood.

It has been and is the purpose of the college to give a broad development to all the powers of men and to lay a foundation upon which technical and professional education may be superimposed. In an address before the Council of Church Boards of Education in Chicago a few years ago, President Edmond J. James, of the University of Illinois, stated that he had given his life to technical and professional education and added: "I would rather receive a student from the small college than from any pre-vocational school in existence." In an address on "Efficiency from the Educational Standpoint," President Wm. DeWitt Hyde, of Bowdoin College, said: "I once asked Edward Atkinson, a prominent manufacturer of 25 years ago, 'Why did you, a founder and trustee of the Massachusetts Institute of Tech-

nology, send all four of your boys to Harvard College?' 'Because,' he replied, 'I saw that in the world of large business the technically trained men usually fill the second places and liberally trained men usually fill the first places.' "[8]

Many pressure groups have tried to change the course of the college. For a little while too much attention was paid to their propaganda and it began to appear that the college would soon become a prevocational school. Such a course would prove a sad loss to church and school. President Edmond J. James, of the University of Illinois, said: "I believe in large part we owe the fairest fruits of American Education to the American College that does not exist, of course, as a separate unit in any of our great State Universities. I would bet my money on a graduate of a College of Liberal Arts who had decided to go into engineering and had never studied engineering a single hour rather than on a graduate engineer without this liberal outlook. I would rather take a man who goes out from college without any training in the specific things that lead to medicine than the man who has spent two or four years of that time in a Medical School and failed to get this fundamental training." Should the college resign its position of supreme importance and power merely to dwindle down into a prevocational or professional institution, serious results would be felt both in Church and State. This is illustrated today by the plight of the numerous State Teacher Training institutions which are making desperate efforts to become colleges.

Unquestionably teaching students how to think and leading them to think has been one of the major purposes of the liberal arts college. It has selected, stimulated, trained, and educated minds and thereby has proved itself a great training ground for scholarship. It has imparted to its students a love

---

[8]*The American Missionary*, May, 1916, pp. 112-13.

for truth, an open mind in its search, a larger ability to evaluate and relate facts, and a desire and an ability to judge rightly between the old and the new. It is no surprise that many able investigators of new truth and many gifted champions of old truth have come out of the college.

The editors of *Who's Who in America* have frequently called attention to the exceedingly large proportion of those who have rendered distinguished service to the world who have come from what may be termed small colleges. They have recently issued a beautiful little book, *The Memorial Everlasting,* urging that gifts both large and small be given to these institutions. The book is dedicated "To those great souls who have conceived Education as the salvation of democracy—who have given of their worldly wealth that others might perpetuate their ideals." The case for the small college is clearly stated: "A record of the product of the small colleges goes far to prove their value. A very large proportion of graduates of the colleges devote themselves to occupations that lead to betterment of society rather than to individual distinction or financial remuneration. If the contribution of small colleges were eliminated in these fields, the ministry, missions, the teaching profession, medicine, and all altruistic activities would suffer irreparably."[9]

Another vital objective is constantly before the college. Culture, the knowledge and appreciation of the best that has gone before in the history of the race, is a worthy end. Development of the intellect, the ability to think straight, to understand confusing situations, and to see clearly and understandingly is a needed thing. But a third objective is essential and this is the chief function of the college. Culture deals largely with a body of knowledge, but knowledge alone, even of the nature and doctrines of religion, does not make a man religious.

[9]A. N. Marquis Co., *The Memorial Everlasting,* 1938, p. 17.

The Christian college is committed to an objective in which religion occupies a central place, becomes a dynamic instead of an interesting thing to study, and gives meaning and unity to the whole. If the Church is not interested, through ignorance or indifference, in strengthening its colleges for this job, it throws away its one great opportunity in this field; we might almost say its birthright. Character building, through broad education based on religion, is the most distinctive emphasis of the college, the great need of the world. To fail here is to leave to chance the spiritual development of our most intelligent young people in an educational system essentially non-religious. But character is not an accident, nor is it a mere by-product. "The analytical process," said Wilbur Thoburn, "destroys much of our power of doing. By the time we have studied our steam—analyzed it—to find out what it is, it has become cold water. By the time we have thought much about the emotional and religious life that we have led—analyzed it—the emotion is all gone, or it may be that it is displaced by another. Cold water that has once been steam is insipid and disagreeable."

Perhaps the most recent discussion of the right of religion to a central place in education is involved in the controversy over the proposal by President Hutchins to make pure intellect the focal point of higher learning. Replying to this from the standpoint of the social scientist, Professor Harry D. Gideonse, formerly of the University of Chicago, now of Columbia University, in his book,[10] points out the fact that education should be concerned with the whole man and not merely his brain, and should provide for youth the powerful emotional dynamics which are being developed in Germany, Italy, and Russia. In a later article he declared:

---

[10]Harry D Gideonse, *The Higher Learning in a Democracy* (Farrar & Rinehart, 1937).

"To maintain social cohesion, something beyond the usual intellectual program is required. The deepest challenge to formal education in a democratic society is to find emotional equivalents in its program for the type of thing that is likely to make the totalitarian appeal irresistible. If we do not re-orient ourselves in this direction, we may have to resign ourselves to a satisfaction of the aesthetic, emotional and physical needs of the young by the man on horseback who will in some way manage to give expression to the emotionally starved." "This is just another way of saying," said B. Warren Brown, "that thoughtful secular educators themselves are not satisfied with the colossal machine which they have set up. There is too much mechanism and not enough life. They propose pure scholarship but this produces philosopher-spectators, not participants in life. They offer scientific technique but the result is often narrow specialization. They emphasize vocations as the central point, which is a complete surrender to self-interest and economic motives." They urge democracy as the unifying objective, but it leads chiefly to a wide diffusion of many types of training for many types of need, with little depth or understanding or unity, rather more confusion. All these objectives have been seriously advanced both in discussion and in practice as virtual substitutes for spiritual objectives in education. If the spiritual and Christian element is not to be supplanted as a central motive, or even as a substantial factor, in training the next generation, it must reassert itself. It will most effectively do this in the colleges of the Church.

It is not easy to "see life steadily and to see it whole." When Boeckh, perhaps the greatest of the Hellenists, came to sum up the defects of the Greek genius, he used this language: "While the Greeks saw each particular thing in its concrete shape, and in all their work strove for supreme

excellence, the vision of all things in a universal interdependence was denied them." To fail here is to fail indeed.

An education that will produce the broad results sought must deal with the emotional as well as with the intellectual side of men's lives. It must be an education of the emotions and the will as well as an education of the intellect. It must help to make men fearless and brave, sympathetic and sensible, deep but without narrowness, humble but courageous. It must lead men to create, not to destroy; to practice justice, not merely to talk of unselfishness; to live a certain regulated life, rather than to live to dominate the lives of others. Such an education comes from personal influence and must find its safe basis in the truths of religion. Dr. James K. Patterson, for many years the President of the University of Kentucky, said, "I believe that collegiate work can be done more effectively in a college whose matriculation is relatively small than in a larger college or university which provides undergraduate instruction, and this mainly because the classes are relatively small. They are not taught by tutors but by professors in charge of departments who come into more intimate personal contact with their students, take the proper measure of their intellectual powers and are able to adapt their instruction to individual wants. They can much more readily apprehend the difficulties under which individual students labor, the obstacles they encounter, and can address themselves intelligently and sympathetically to their removal, adapting their instruction to the capacity of the recipient and stimulating by personal contact to sustained and healthy activity.

"Again, other things being equal, I prefer that the collegiate education of the undergraduate be obtained in a denominational school, because during the period of adolescence the moral and religious character of the student is formed. Sound and vigorous moral character must find its

ultimate sanction in religious principle. In the denominational college, religious instruction, not necessarily dogmatic or denominational but distinctly Christian in character, form a necessary part of the training of undergraduates. These conditions, I think, are fully met in a denominational college."

Dr. Jesse while president of the University of Missouri, pleading for more efficient supervision of the religious life in educational institutions, said: "Many thoughtful people are inquiring whether it is wise to send a student from his high school at home into the multitudes that throng our larger colleges and universities. Is it not better to send him first to a small college that will watch over his life as well as his studies? While our own university has not yet reached the enrollment of some others, it is large enough for a student to be lost in it. It is not one of the smaller, safer institutions."

The college has an opportunity to serve in meeting this need. The intimate contact with teachers and students is one of the most helpful aspects of college life and provides one of its most enduring influences. This creates what we call "the atmosphere," which no one can define, but which no one can fail to feel. "The atmosphere in which a boy is educated counts for much," said the late President W. O. Thompson, of Ohio State University. "I am in no way untrue to state institutions when I say that in our day a boy might become a bachelor or master in almost any one of the best of them and be as ignorant of the Bible, the moral and spiritual truth which it represents and the fundamental principles of religion, their nature and value to society, as if he had been educated in a non-Christian country. Who is to supply this lack if not the Christian college?"

It is becoming increasingly hard for the great universities to assimilate the large number of freshmen that enter these institutions. Some of the presidents declare: "We want our

students more mature in mind and morals." What an opportunity and responsibility does this throw upon the college! Four years spent within its walls will fashion the iron of character into the steel which, under the touch of the university, may be fashioned into the delicate and useful tools to accomplish the world's work.

The Chuch should call out to the youth: "Don't specialize too soon! Get some breadth of vision. Build a foundation broad and deep upon which the superstructure of after years may be built. Learn of God's Word and God's handiwork until you can exclaim with the Psalmist: 'He brought me forth also into a large place.' "

There is no conflict between the college and the university and the technical and professional schools. The greatest of our educators have recognized this fact and have clearly seen the benefit of the college to student, to State, and to Church. In an address before a Congregational Association, the late President Cyrus Northrup, of the University of Minnesota, declared:

"It is not possible for a university under any condition whatever—a state university—to so carefully cultivate the religious spirit and the religious life as it is in your denominational college conducted, widely, liberally, broadly, for the purpose of cultivating religion as well as education. You want such institutions for the creation of men who will especially go into the ministry for the training of men; who will go into other occupations of life, like journalism and all the occupations that especially influence the public. You want these institutions to train these men specially; and most of all, you Christian fathers and mothers who fear for the welfare of your boys and girls, you want institutions where you know that the influence exerted upon them in the most formative period of their life will be such as would be consistent with your wishes and with the atmosphere of

your homes. I bear testimony as President of the University of Minnesota to the efficiency and excellence of the denominational colleges and the desirableness of having them continued."

Co-operating agencies in the field of education may insure the peace and the freedom and the progress of our democracy. This was in the mind of W. O. Thompson when he said: "The denominational college supported by the church may become the best expression of religious freedom in teaching that the generation knows. My conviction is that the church will be not only traitor to its own interest, but also recreant to its duty to the state, if it shall relinquish its emphasis upon the religious fundamentals. There are elements entering into our education which the church owes society to supply." Cyrus Northrup, while president emeritus of the University of Minnesota, said: "Now is the time for the church to equip and endow its colleges, not alone that they may do their good work but that they may hold the state institutions within reasonable bounds of faith and practice." How great this influence has been no one knows.

Democracy Needs the College

The Christian college is needed by democracy. "All of the New England colleges," said President W. O. Thompson, "were born of the Christian impulse and on the theory that the Christian Church owed a duty to society in the matter of education." Society's need is still evident; the duty of the Church remains clear and urgent. Its contribution now and in the past is the most needed element in civilization. At a meeting of the Pan-Presbyterian Alliance in Pittsburgh, Dr. Thompson said: "The Christian College, rightly equipped and endowed, has the supreme call and the supreme opportunity of the hour."

"If higher education should become exclusively a function of the state," said President W. P. Tolley, Alleghany College, "it would be the most serious catastrophe that could happen in America. In a day when the state is becoming more and more important and the individual less and less, independent colleges are our strongest citadels of freedom. If they should be crippled or starved by needless competition on the part of the state, the people of America may be taught only the dogmas of the party in power."

The diversity in the control of our education is a glory and strength to our nation. Only twice in the world's history has a monopoly of education been sought and achieved. In the early ages the Church secured a monopoly. The clergy became haughty, they denied education to the masses, and the long night of the Dark Ages ensued. At a later period the Prussian state decided to take all of education into its hand. From the kindergarten to the highest university the power and ideals of the state were dominant. The results of this throughout the long, cruel World War have been felt by every individual in every land. Evidences of its baneful effects can now be seen in the chaotic condition of Europe.

A former President of the United States said over the radio: "A primary purpose of education is a product of high character and noble ideals, which regard moral and spiritual qualities superior to mere material things, without which any purely economic system would collapse." He then added regarding liberal arts colleges: "Their service for the youth is a guarantee of equality of cultural opportunity and a bulwark for the spiritual life of the generation in which our children will have to live." Charles R. Mann, for years the eminent director of the American Council on Education, reinforced this thought: "We are fighting on a new social frontier striving to create a social order that reveals an intelligence comparable with that shown in our material achieve-

ments. We cannot win this fight with machines and money alone. Nor will technical skill by itself prevail. We must have also that social and moral intelligence which develops when high native ability is disciplined through human struggle and meditation. In achieving this end the liberal arts colleges must play an increasingly important role."

Many deep-seated and far-reaching problems have ever confronted men and women. Today on every side and in every land the weary in heart are longing for satisfaction and hope, and are seeking some method or way or power by which they may understand and help remove the troubles which beset their lives and the social order. Many of the familiar institutions and ways of living are seriously called in question and some of the very foundations of the social order are being assailed. The bland belief in an ordered progress into the good life has been ruthlessly shattered. Lawlessness, greed, oppression, selfishness, envy, jealousy, hatred, fear, war, threaten our civilization. Our attention is called to the fundamental and far-reaching lack of moral integrity. Men of culture who have been trained to think and who know the resources and the power of religion are needed. The college is heroically doing its bit.

The influence of the society of the college, with its spiritual and clear ideals, is of highest value to the whole social order. "If the school leads the pupil to assimilate into his own conduct the adaptations which have been worked out by the community in which he lives," said M. V. O'Shea, "it will have accomplished its highest purpose. But this is manifestly an understatement of the case. It is assumed that the race has already achieved perfect adjustment; that the forces which condition human life are fully understood; that all the possible modes of utilizing them for human advantage have been discovered; that an ideal ethical and

political life has been achieved. But one needs only to glance at this doctrine to feel its insufficiency."[11]

After an illness of several months Harry Emerson Fosdick returned to his pulpit in New York and declared that "modernism is excessively preoccupied with the intellectual aspects of experience whereas spiritual life sweeps a far wider ambit than that." He challenged the idea of adjustment, and declared it was not the business of religion to set up adjustments but to produce men and women who are morally maladjusted to their environment and who stand out from it and sit in ethical judgment upon it." He adds, "Our modern culture needs no longer accomodation and harmonizers, but intellectual and moral challengers."[12]

Without disparaging the university which discharges a much more complicated educational function in a less personal way, recognizing the public junior college which serves a more limited local function, it may be said that the four-year liberal arts college has built a unique place in the intellectual and spiritual life of the nation. It is the focal point of selected young people in contact with the best culture of the past, with intellectual companionship and stimulus, with spiritual awakening and the challenge of modern life. To touch education at this focal point and in this intimate way is a supreme opportunity for the Church to make a quality contribution to the solution of the enormous problems of school life in a democracy so courageously faced by the State.

Comprising as it does a large part of the American democracy the Church has a vital interest and a unique function in the field of education. It indirectly affects all educational efforts through its worship and preaching, its teaching in

---

[11]M. V. O'Shea, *Education as Adjustment* (Longmans, Green & Co., 1903), p. 103.

[12]*The Christian Century*, November 20, 1935, p. 1481.

the home and in the church school, its contribution of teachers and administrators, its service to the students of school and university, and more directly by the service of its own colleges. Great opportunities for service and co-operation are now presented to the Church. Will it recognize its opportunity? Will it discharge its obligation? In its effort to help save society, will it lose its own life, if need be, in bringing the world in touch with Him who is the Way and the Truth and the Life?

Will the Church, recognizing that the college has a great, a vital, a permanent function, give of its time and energy and money so that its colleges may be institutions of strength, of suitable equipment, and of high educational standards—worthy of its boys and girls? If the Church makes it possible for the college to do its work honestly and courageously, its place in the heart and life of the democracy will be secure. In this way the Church will make its lasting contribution to its own life and to the life of the Republic and of the world.

Date Due			
Ag 6 '46			
Ag 21 '46			
Ja 27 '47			
My 31 '48			
OC 12 '49			
OC 25 '49			
AP 25 '51			
JE 2 '55			
AUG [illegible] '57			
NOV [illegible] '57			
[illegible]			
[illegible]			

LC427 .S97
The church and education,
Princeton Theological Seminary-Speer Library
1 1012 00026 4079